

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

DEC 18 1939

CONTENTS

	PAGE
FRANÇON, MARCEL.—Marot au Châtelet, - - - - -	1
KOENIG, V. F.—Counter-Notes on Jean Renart, - - - - -	8
SPITZER, LEO.—Russisch-nationale Stilkunde, - - - - -	16
FITCH, G. B.—'Favras' and Hugo's 'Marie Tudor,' - - - - -	24
HAVENS, G. R.—The Dates of Diderot's Birth and Death, - - - - -	31
BORISH, M. E.—A Second Version of John Day's 'Peregrinatio Scholastica,'	35
MCGING, MARGARET E.—A Possible Source for the Female Disguise in Byron's 'Don Juan,' - - - - -	39
BOOTH, B. A.—Moore to Hobhouse: an Unpublished Letter, - - - - -	42
WILCOX, S. C.—A Manuscript Addition to Hazlitt's Essay "On the Fear of Death," - - - - -	45
WECTER, DIXON.—Burke's Error Regarding Sugar-Crystals, - - - - -	47
REESE, HAROLD.—A Borrower from Quarles and Herbert, - - - - -	50
POTTER, G. R.—Donne's Paradoxes in 1707, - - - - -	53
BERNBAUM, ERNEST.—Recent Works on Prose Fiction Before 1800, - - - - -	54

REVIEWS:—

JULIUS PETERSEN, <i>Die Wissenschaft von der Dichtung</i> . [Archer Taylor.]	65
GEORG BONDI (pub.), <i>Briefwechsel zwischen George und Hofmannsthal</i> . [E. Feise.]	67
S. BATTAGLIA (ed.), <i>Boccaccio: Il Filocolo</i> ; V. BRANCA (ed.), <i>Boccaccio: Le Rime. L'Amorosa Visione. La Caccia di Diana</i> . [O. S. Singleton.]	69
O. J. CAMPBELL, <i>Comical Satyre and Shakespeare's "Troilus and Cressida."</i> [Tucker Brooke.]	71
H. MARQUARDT, <i>Die altenglischen Kenningar</i> . [Kemp Malone.]	73
A. CAMPBELL (ed.), <i>The Battle of Brunanburh</i> . [Kemp Malone.]	74
BRIEF MENTION: WINIFRED NEWTON, <i>Le Thème de Phèdre et d'Hippolyte</i> ; ROBERT HAMILTON, <i>The Amazing Career of Sir Giles Overreach</i> ; JOHN WILCOX, <i>The Relation of Molière to Restoration Comedy</i> ; V. F. HOPPER, <i>Medieval Number Symbolism</i> ; J. E. WELLS, <i>A Manual of the Writings in Middle English</i> ; N. E. GRIFFIN (ed.), <i>Historia Destructionis Troiae</i> ,	76
CORRESPONDENCE: ROBERT A. HALL, JR., <i>Italian Etymological Notes</i> ; Winckelmann,	79

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER
RAYMOND D. HAVENS

KEMP MALONE
HAZELTON SPENCER

C. S. SINGLETON

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are *not* used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, *not* vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RR.*, *SP.*, *RMS.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

The General Index of volumes 1 to 50, xii + 310 pages, was published
in December 1935. The price is \$5.00 net.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

THE GENIUS OF THE GERMAN LYRIC

An Historical Survey of its Formal and Metaphysical Values

By A. CLOSS, *Head of the Germ. Dep., University of Bristol*

SOME ENGLISH REVIEWS

SPECTATOR: "For minute and careful research, and as a chronicle of knowledge, there is nothing to compare with it in the history of English song."

SCOTSMAN: "Closs is a man of immense learning, and on the form and the contemporary spirit of the various periods of German lyrical poetry he has much to tell the ordinary student. . . . The book is delightful to read. To the student . . . the book will be invaluable."

CONTEMPORARY REVIEW: "Closs is able to speak in perfect freedom. He extols nothing unduly and withholds nothing from us. This book is, and will remain, an outstanding achievement."

SOME AMERICAN REVIEWS

MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL: "The first comprehensive study of the German lyric to be published in any language. . . . It is a new and important contribution to the literature of its field, and should be in every college library."

ANGLO-GERMAN REVIEW: "This is a pioneer book. Professor Closs gives us here the fruit of many years of his own study and research, in which he reveals himself as an independent thinker and a sound critic."

THE GERMAN QUARTERLY: "The book is an outstanding contribution to the study of the German lyric."

476 pages. 18s. net

MESSRS. ALLEN & UNWIN, LONDON

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LV

JANUARY, 1940

Number 1

MAROT AU CHÂTELET

Clément Marot, arrêté vers la fin de février 1526, fut conduit au Châtelet. De quoi l'accusait-on? D'avoir mangé du lard en Carême, nous dit-on. Six jours après son emprisonnement, Marot écrit une épître "à Monsieur Bouchart, Docteur en Theologie." Le Poète se défend d'être hérétique:

Point ne suis lutheriste
Ne zuinglien, et moins anabaptiste.

Il se demande si le *Docteur Catholique* a une "picque" contre lui, ou s'il prend "saveur" à l'affliger. Non, dit Marot, c'est "quelque faulx entendre" qui t'a rendu si sévère. Puis, dans l'épître à Lyon Jamet, Marot raconte comment le rat a été pris dans une trappe

pour autant qu'il avoit
Mangé le lard et la chair toute crue.

Mais y a-t-il là une allusion à l'accusation portée contre Marot? N'est-il pas naturel d'attraper les rats en les attirant par un morceau de viande?

N'est-il pas possible que Marot, après avoir imaginé de raconter la fable du lion et du rat, se soit servi de ce prétendu grief, pour détourner l'attention, pour montrer qu'on lui reproche une peccadille et que ses juges sont grotesques? On nous dit que c'était un crime que de ne pas observer les règles de l'abstinence pendant le Carême, et on nous rapporte la bulle du 17 mai 1525, où le Pape engageait le pouvoir séculier à sévir contre ceux qui faisaient gras en Carême. Mais ces mesures visaient, on le sait, les luthériens, et ce n'était pas seulement une simple pratique qu'on cherchait à réprimer, mais une foi nouvelle.

L'évêque de Chartres, Louis Guillard, ordonne aux officiers de

son tribunal, le 13 mars 1526, de faire le procès de Marot qui est accusé de plusieurs excès, délits et crimes, et même d'hérésie: *de et super nonnullis excessibus delictis et criminibus, etiam heresis*.¹ Il n'est, nulle part, mention que Marot ait fait maigre un jour d'abstinence. Mais continuons d'examiner chronologiquement les pièces qui se rapportent à l'incarcération de Marot. Car, à quelle date Marot écrivit-il la ballade *Contre celle qui fut sa mie*? M. Villey² remarque qu'il est possible que cette ballade n'ait été écrite que dans la prison de Chartres, où Marot fut transféré, après l'intervention de Louis Guillard. Car, au Châtelet, Marot avait autre chose à faire que d'écrire une ballade à sa belle. Quelle que soit l'époque à laquelle Marot ait composé ce poème,—et on ne le date que d'après l'interprétation qu'on lui prête—c'est là, pour la première fois, dans le refrain qui, nous dit M. Villey, "joue sur un vieux dicton," c'est dans ce refrain que se trouve une allusion à la prétendue accusation portée contre le poète.

Mais en quelle année Marot aurait-il fait gras en Carême? Ce n'est que le 10 juin 1525 qu'une ordonnance avait donné force de loi à la bulle du 17 mai précédent. Marot, semble-t-il, ne pouvait pas être poursuivi pour une faute commise avant cette date. Or, en 1526, le jour de Pâques était le 1^{er} avril; c'est dire que le Carême n'a commencé, cette année-là, que le 14 février. M. Becker,³ malgré les remarques de P. Villey,⁴ montre, d'une façon qui paraît concluante, qu'en l'espace de moins d'un mois, il faudrait, si Marot avait été accusé d'avoir fait gras en 1526, placer des événements trop nombreux: "Bruch des Fastengebets, Delation, Haftbefehl und Verhaftung, Einlieferung ins Châtelet und Verhör, Epistel an Lyon Jamet, Anrufung des Bishofs von Chartres und dessen Erlassz." D'autre part, si l'on n'admet pas que Marot était à Paris, mais si l'on suppose qu'il accompagnait la cour, éloignée de Paris à ce moment, et si l'on tient compte du fait que l'évêque de Chartres

¹ Clément Marot. *Œuvres*, édit. E. G. Guiffrey (Paris, 1911), I, 107.

² P. Villey, *Marot et Rabelais* (Paris, 1923), p. 22, n. 2.

³ Ph. A. Becker, Clément Marot, *sein Leben und seine Dichtung* [München, 1926], p. 40.

⁴ P. Villey, "Chronologie des œuvres de Marot," *Bulletin du Bibliophile* [1920], p. 206, n. 1.—P. Villey (*ibid.*, p. 207) remarque aussi qu'on "est tenté de se demander si [l'épître à Lyon Jamet] n'a pas été composée après coup, par une sorte de retour amusé que fit Marot sur son aventure."

ne dit avoir ordonné le procès de Marot qu'après avoir étudié son cas: *Visis per nos informationibus et chargiis [. . .] factis [. . .], audita etiam requesta et conclusionibus dicti promotoris*,⁵ il semble que Marot n'ait pu être accusé de n'avoir pas observé, pendant le carême de 1526, les règles d'abstinence.

Mais, si, en 1526, on ne pouvait reprocher à Marot d'avoir mangé de la viande en Carême, les registres du Parlement montrent que, le 18 mars 1532, Marot et ses complices étaient "chargez d'avoir mengé de la chair durant le temps de karesme et autres iours prohibez." Le 20 mars 1532, on cessa les poursuites contre Marot. On voit qu'alors l'accusation contre Marot était précise, qu'elle était grave, car le poète avait fait gras publiquement, avec d'autres complices, par forfanterie, et avec une intention de scandale, et, pourtant, en 1532, au bout de deux jours, Etienne Clavier, "secrétaire des roy et royne de Navarre," se porta garant pour Marot: le Poète était hors de cause.

Rapportons que le premier *coq-à-l'asne*, adressé à Lyon Jamet, a été daté de 1532 par Guiffrey (*op. cit.*, I, 175) qui nous dit expressément qu'en rappelant le refrain de la *Ballade contre celle qui fut sa mye*, "Prenez le, il a mengé le lard," Marot fait allusion à la mésaventure de 1532 "et non à celle de 1526." Or, ce même *coq-à-l'asne* est daté par M. Villey du printemps de 1530 et M. Guy (*op. cit.*, p. 148), d'après Becker, propose une autre date: "(automne 1526?)."

On voit l'incertitude de toutes les dates qui ont été proposées et qu'il est impossible de faire état de ces pièces pour déterminer l'accusation portée contre Marot en 1526. M. Guy (*op. cit.*, p. 187) nous dit qu'en 1532, "le Parlement réveilla soudain la procédure ouverte contre [Marot] en 1526"; mais l'incrimination de 1532 est spécifique, celle de 1526 ne l'est pas; en 1532, pendant le Carême, on accuse Marot d'avoir mangé de la viande en Carême. En 1526, Marot se défend seulement contre ceux qui le soupçonnent de n'être pas catholique. M. Guy nous dit aussi: "l'inculpé feint [en 1526] d'ignorer la chose dont on l'accuse, ne parle pas de banquet, ni de Carême, et pense acheter la clef des champs au prix, vaille que vaille, d'un acte de foi." C'est qu'en effet il s'agit, en 1526, d'une question de foi,⁶ tandis qu'en 1532 ce n'est pas d'opin-

⁵ Cf. Guiffrey, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

⁶ Félix Frank a bien dit que Clément Marot fut "détenu en 1526 pour

ions religieuses qu'il s'agit directement, mais de pratique, comme le lui reprochera, plus tard, Sagon, qui dit à Marot

tu mengeois en Karesme du lard,
Non pas caché, mais devant tout le monde.

Mais l'emprisonnement de 1526 pose une autre question assez curieuse. "Par deux fois," (dans la *Ballade Contre celle qui fut sa mye* et dans le premier *Coq-à-l'asne*), d'après M. Guy (*op. cit.*, p. 135), Marot "a avoué que, s'il avait tenu secrets les caprices de [sa] belle, il eût évité cette affaire, la prison, et un procès qui risquait de la mener loin." Ce serait à cause de la chanson *Ma dame ne m'a pas vendu* que Marot aurait été incarcéré. Or M. Villey ne peut situer cette chanson qu'avant 1527, sans plus de précision. En outre, M. Villey nous dit (*Marot et Rabelais* [Paris, 1923], p. 21) que Marot, "au moment où il fut jeté au Châtelet, vit dans cette affaire une vengeance de femme: c'était Isabeau qui l'avait dénoncé aux docteurs de Sorbonne." Mais, pour P. Villey, ce serait le rondeau de l'*Inconstance d'Isabeau* dont la belle aurait voulu se venger. Guiffrey (*op. cit.*, I, 78), nous parlant des amours de Marot, déclare:

Marot venait en effet de former une liaison qui devait exercer sur le reste de son existence une influence funeste. Cette liaison eut pour résultat par la suite de le faire mettre en prison, et, comme autre conséquence, elle le poussa à déclarer la guerre aux docteurs de la Sorbonne et aux moines et à mettre un pied dans le parti protestant.

Femme fatale, vraiment! Citons enfin M. Plattard (*Marot* [Paris, 1938] p. 33): Marot fut "appréhendé, sur la dénonciation d'une femme, une certaine Ysabeau qu'il surnomma Luna (peut-être en raison de son caractère fantasque et lunaire)."

Relevons les textes. La *ballade contre celle qui fut sa mye* contient ces vers:

Un jour rescrivis à m'amie
Son inconstance seulement
Mais elle ne fut endormie
A me le rendre chauldement.

Dans le premier *coq-à-l'asne* se lit le vers suivant:

Ma dame ne m'a pas vendu,

cause d'hérésie" (*L'Heptaméron de la reine Marguerite de Navarre*, édit. F. Frank [Paris, 1879], I, xxvi).

qui est l'incipit de la chanson que nous avons citée, écrite avant 1527.

Ainsi Marot nous déclare bien qu'il a été trahi par une femme; mais qui est cette femme, Marot ne nous le confie pas. Ysabeau? Luna? Mais pourquoi identifier la dénonciatrice de Marot, et Ysabeau? S'agit-il vraiment d'une maîtresse de Marot? Le rondeau *De l'inconstance d'Ysabeau* n'est pas bien méchant, ni la chanson *Ma dame ne m'a pas vendu*. Il paraît excessif qu'une femme inconstante se venge de vers peu injurieux en allant en dénoncer l'auteur auprès de "M. Bouchard, Docteur en Théologie," et en accusant Marot d'un crime que celui-ci semble ignorer. Et puis, jamais Marot, quand il raconte son internement au Châtelet, ne prononce le nom d'Ysabeau. Il ne parle de Luna que dans un poème, dans *l'Enfer*, car, s'il dit, dans le premier *coq-à-l'asne*, que :

Toutes choses qui sont coiffées
Ont moult de lunes en la teste,

ces vers ne prouvent pas que la dénonciatrice soit Ysabeau ni une autre femme (ou la même) nommée, à cause de ses goûts instables, Luna. M. Guy fait très justement observer (*op. cit.*, p. 148) que "dans sa réponse (avril ou mai 1527?) [au premier *coq-à-l'asne*] Jamet prodigue les plaisanteries très poivrées [. . .]. Mais aux vers relatifs à Luna [. . .] nulle allusion n'est faite par l'ami Lyon. C'eût été, pourtant, le point essentiel." Si Jamet ne parle pas de Luna-Ysabeau c'est que, peut-être, Marot n'en parlait pas non plus.

Nous arrivons, enfin, au texte définitif. C'est à Chartres, où il fut transféré après avoir été emprisonné au Châtelet, que Marot composa *l'Enfer*. C'est donc là le texte qui, avec les épîtres à Bouchard et à Lyon Jamet, est le plus contemporain de l'événement. *L'Enfer* ne mentionne, nulle part, que Marot soit accusé d'avoir fait gras en Carême. Marot proteste de ses sentiments catholiques, il montre que son nom Clément

n'est point le nom de Lutheriste
Ains est le nom (à bien l'interpréter)
Du plus contraire ennemy de Luther.

Marot nous dit aussi, dans *l'Enfer*, comme il fut

par l'instinct de Luna
Mené au lieu plus mal sentant que soulfhre,
Par cinq ou six ministres de ce gouffre.

Plus loin (v. 324) il ajoute aux noms des personnes qui le connaissent celui de Luna. Celle-ci est mentionnée après *Juppiter* (François I^{er}), *Pallas* (Marguerite d'Angoulême) et *Cybelle* (Louise de Savoie):

Quant à Luna, diverse et variable,
Trop me cognoist son faulx cueur odieux.

Est-ce que le mot *Luna*—à côté des termes allégoriques qui désignent le roi, sa sœur et sa mère,—ne semble pas, lui aussi, employé dans un sens métaphorique? ⁷ Et puis ce mot latin n'est-il pas curieux? Guiffrey (*op. cit.*, p. 110) nous rapporte que

les uns ont prétendu reconnaître sous un nom supposé, mais allégorique, la célèbre Diane de Poitiers [. . .] d'autres ont voulu voir dans Ysabeau une incarnation de l'Eglise catholique, et dans le récit de cette aventure une fiction du poète pour raconter les tracasseries des papistes contre un adepte de la foi nouvelle.

Guiffrey reproduit aussi la note de Dolet: "Marot prend Luna pour une femme inconstante et pleine de malice qui fut cause de son emprisonnement." Rappelons que, pour les Pères de l'Eglise, *luna* désigne bien l'Eglise, et la comparaison est faite à cause du caractère de mutabilité (*propter ipsam mutabilitatem*) qu'on reconnaît à la lune et à l'Eglise: "*Ecclesia comparatur lunae quae in pace crescit, in persecutione minuitur*" (Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus* [Parisiis, 1879], CCXIX, 157), "*Ecclesia ut luna, modo prosperis clara, modo adversis obscura.*" (*Ibid.*, 233.) Ajoutons qu'en 1570, Pontus de Tyard fit graver un jeton dont une des faces représente la lune au dessus de la mer. On lit la devise: *Pontus me sequitur*. Jeandet ⁸ se demande si la lune n'est pas "une double allégorie sous le voile de laquelle, par une alliance du sacré et du profane [. . .] se cachent tout à la fois l'Eglise ou la Religion et Pasithée, la dame des pensées de Pontus." La mer suit la lune, comme Pontus suit l'Eglise et sa bien-aimée. Il est temps, maintenant, de conclure.

CONCLUSION. Les critiques ont dit que Marot fut dénoncé, en

⁷ Pour Dreux du Radier, LUNA désignerait la Sorbonne; cf. *Récréations historiques*, t. I, citées par l'auteur dans ses *Mémoires historiques, critiques, et anecdotes des reines et régentes de France* [Amsterdam, chez Michel Rey: 1776], iv, 481, n. 2.

⁸ J. P.-Abel Jeandet, *Pontus de Tyard* (Paris, 1860), p. 91.

1526, "pour avoir mangé de la viande en carême."⁹ A l'appui de cette accusation, les seuls documents qu'on invoque sont la *Ballade contre celle qui fut sa mye* et le premier *coq-à-l'asne* où Marot ne fait que jouer sur un dicton populaire: *Prenez le, il a mengé le lard*, à une date qu'il n'est pas possible de déterminer avec précision. C'est dans l'épître à Lyon Jamet qu'il est mention de lard et de *chair toute crue*; mais rien ne prouve qu'il y ait là une allusion à l'accusation portée contre Marot. On peut n'y voir qu'un détail pittoresque qui montre comment le rat a été attiré et comment il a été pris, de même que le lion fut, à son tour, pris au piège, un jour qu'il était sorti de sa caverne "pour chercher sa pasture." Si Marot a été inquiété et poursuivi pour n'avoir pas observé les règles d'abstinence pendant les jours maigres, ce n'est pas en 1526, mais en 1532, époque à laquelle des documents certains indiquent avec précision le grief fait à Marot. Nous pensons qu'il était, en 1526, accusé d'hérésie et qu'il avait été emprisonné par l'autorité civile à l'instigation de l'Eglise. Luna désignerait ainsi l'Eglise Catholique¹⁰ et non pas une femme à laquelle Marot aurait reproché son infidélité et son inconstance et qui se serait vengée de son ancien ami. Les pièces où Marot déclare que sa belle a un *cœur muable*, *qu'elle est faulse et lasche de cœur* sont plutôt malicieuses que méchantes, et l'on ne voit pas qu'il y ait là cause à des représailles bien cruelles. Nous ne trouvons aucune raison d'identifier Luna et Ysabeau ou Luna et Diane. Il nous semble très fantaisiste d'imaginer que Marot éprouva pour Ysabeau une passion malheureuse et fatale qui poussa l'homme et la femme qui en furent l'objet à s'entredéchirer. Le caractère de Marot ne nous paraît pas celui d'un grand amoureux. Nous voyons en lui un homme un peu sensuel, peut-être, mais, en somme, plus tourné vers la vie douce que vers les orages de la passion.¹¹ Nous nous refusons à le trouver victime d'une trahison féminine; mais nous pensons, au contraire, que ses

⁹ Villey, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

¹⁰ Les "choses qui sont coiffées" seraient, pour nous, les moines et les prêtres catholiques qui portent "bonnetz carrez ou rondz, ou chapeurons fourrez d'ermes," ou ceux qui cherchent à cacher leurs oreilles d'âne sous leurs chapeaux (Cf. *Les Marguerites de la Marguerite des Princesses*, édit. F. Frank [Paris, 1873], p. 290). Marguerite d'Angoulême fait souvent mention du Soleil, qui semble un emblème du Dieu de la religion évangélique.

¹¹ Cf. les remarques de P. Villey (*op. cit.*, p. 24) sur l'amour de Marot pour Anne.

attaques contre la Sorbonne, contre l'Eglise, contre les moines, n'étaient pas le résultat d'un simple accident. Marot, comme Erasme, comme Dolet, comme tous les esprits libres de son temps, a des raisons profondes d'en avoir à l'Eglise Catholique. Mais Marot avait intérêt, lui-même, à cacher les accusations que faisait contre lui *je ne sçay quel papelard*, il pouvait chercher à faire croire qu'il avait été l'objet de la vengeance d'une femme, qu'on l'avait mis en prison pour un crime dont on ne pouvait que rire, même si le cas avait quelque chose de sérieux.

Si notre explication est acceptée, il en ressort qu'il faut réviser l'interprétation de quelques pièces de Marot, que la date de certains poèmes est fausse, que la personnalité de Marot est un peu différente de celle qui est traditionnellement acceptée.

MARCEL FRANÇON

Harvard University

COUNTER-NOTES ON JEAN RENART

In his recent "Notes sur Jean Renart"¹ Mr. L. A. Vigneras returns to the charge in support of his dating of the *Escoufle*,² a dating rejected by Mme Lejeune³ and myself⁴ on what I believe I may be pardoned for calling compelling grounds. Apart from the crucial question of whether vss. 22-23 of the *Lai de l'Ombre* actually do constitute, as has been generally supposed, an allusion to the *Escoufle*, Mr. V.'s fresh argument is based upon purely subjective judgment⁵ and is, hence, at best inconclusive. In any event, his entire case rests upon whether or not the *Escoufle* is alluded to

¹ *MLN.*, LIV (1939), 262-66.

² *MP.*, xxx (1933), 241-56.

³ R. Lejeune-Dehousse, *l'Œuvre de Jean Renart* (Paris and Liège, 1935), pp. 213 ff.

⁴ *MP.*, xxxii (1935), 343-52.

⁵ He believes the *Escoufle* lacks the youthful qualities of Renart's other works and gives evidence of a decline in the poet's literary powers. Mme Lejeune, however, characterizes the *Escoufle* (*op. cit.*, p. 393) as "cette œuvre de début à l'esprit juvénile." It is wholly obvious that judgments of this nature are lacking in reliability. If we were to apply such criteria to the dating of Cervantes' works, for instance, should we not be inclined to place the second part of *Quijote* before the first, the *Novelas* before *Galatea*?

in the *Lai*; for, if it is, all arguments tending to place its composition after that of the *Lai* must of necessity crumble.

In vss. 9073-74 of the *Escoufle* Renart seems to distinguish carefully between his own poem and the tale which served as its source by applying the term *roman* to the former and *conte* to the latter. Now, in the *Lai* he says:

22 Par Guillaume qui depieça
L'escoufle et art un a un membre,
Si com li CONTES nous remembre . . .

Why, asks Mr. V., does he use here the word *conte* and not *roman* if he is referring to his own romance? The query is not new; Warren voiced it in these columns thirty years ago,⁶ but prudently refrained from drawing any conclusions. Mr. V. is less reticent: the fact that Renart uses *conte* and not *roman*, he affirms, is evidence that the poet was referring not to his own work but to the tale which he was to utilize some twenty years later as its source. To see whether or not this conclusion is justified, let us turn a moment to the introductory verses of *Guillaume de Dole*. The poem begins:

Cil qui mist cest conte en romans . . .

A few verses farther we find the poet making essentially the same distinction between *conte* and *roman* as in vss. 9073-74 of the *Escoufle*:

26 S'est avis a chascun et samble
Que cil qui a fet le roman
Qu'il trovast les moz des chans,
Si aferent a ceuls del conte.

Nevertheless, to mark his entry into his matter proper, he says:

30 Si commence ici SON CONTE.

Despite the distinction he sometimes maintains between *roman* and *conte*, Jean Renart did, then, on occasion use the latter term with reference to his own work.

The fact is that Vigneras and Warren have made the mistake of assuming that Renart used the two words in their modern acceptations. In the Old French period, *roman* denoted a work in the vernacular. *Conte* was used of any narrative regardless of length; it is, in fact, the term by which the medieval romances were

⁶ *MLN.*, xxiii (1908), 72-73.

ordinarily designated. Thus, Chrétien's *Perceval* was known as *li Contes del Graal*. Jakemes, Author of the *Roman du castelain de Couci*, calls his romance a *conte* (vs. 57), as does Gerbert de Montreuil his *Violete* (vss. 36, 47, 6635), Beaumanoir his *Manekine* (vss. 25, 29, 41), and Renaut his *Galeran de Bretagne* (vs. 7799). *Roman* and *conte* could, consequently, be used interchangeably of works in the vernacular; *conte* could be used as well of narratives in a tongue other than French—Latin or Breton, for instance. It became a literary tradition for romancers to mention the *conte* or *estoire* which they were putting into *roman*, that is, the vernacular, and then to refer to their work as *le roman*, i. e., *le conte en roman*, to distinguish it from the original *conte*. All of the writers mentioned above do just this thing, but, as we have seen, are not thereby prevented from terming their romances *contes* when there is no particular need to maintain the distinction.

It is now amply evident, I believe, that Renart's use of *conte* in the *Lai* to refer to the *Escoufle* is in no wise unusual and certainly it offers no basis for the assumption that Renart was not referring to his own romance. In any case, the passage of the *Lai* in question presupposes familiarity on the part of Renart's public with the thing alluded to. Otherwise the allusion would be lost. Now, in the *Escoufle* the poet tells us that the *conte* upon which he has based his romance is an old and forgotten one, known to few persons besides himself:

40 Ne desque la ou bise souffle
 Ne cuit qu'il ait mie .x. homes
 Ki sacent de cui nos disommes,
 Tant a esté lonc tans celés
 Li contes qui est revelés
 Par moi et mis en escriture.

There can be no doubt, then, that the reference in the *Lai* is to Renart's own work, not to the obscure and unknown *conte*, which, moreover, was doubtless in a foreign tongue.

II. While on this subject, it may not be amiss to expose briefly the grounds on which I believe Mr. V.'s dating of *Guillaume de Dole*⁷ likewise must be rejected. This dating rests upon the supposition that prior to writing the romance Renart was already under the protection of Milon de Nanteuil and had accompanied the

⁷ *RR.*, xxviii (1937), 109-21.

latter on a journey to Aix-la-Chapelle in 1227. Now the fact of the matter is that we do not know for certain that Miles ever was Renart's protector; but, if he was, it was after the composition of *Guillaume de Dole* that he became so. The character of Renart's dedication of the romance to him is sufficient warrant for this:

4

Cil qui mist cest contes en romains . . .
 Veut que ses pris et ses renons
 Voist en Raincien, en Champaigne,
 Et que li biaux Miles l'apregne
 De Nantuel, uns des preus del regne . . .

As Mme Lejeune has gone to some pains to point out,⁸ these verses are not the traditional dedication of the medieval romancer to a patron. It is obvious that Renart is addressing himself—here as in the dedication of the *Escoufle* to the count of Hainaut (vss. 9058-71)—to a person to whom he is unknown. He wishes his worth and renown, or the worth and renown of his work—the reference of the possessives in vs. 4 is ambiguous—to travel to Rheims and come to the attention of Milon. Taking even the interpretation most favorable to Mr. V.'s stand—that is, assuming that *ses pris et ses renons* means the romance's worth and renown, not the poet's—can we suppose that Renart would have expressed himself thus if he had been in close contact with Milon, a member of Milon's household, his former travelling companion? Notice that Renart is not even presuming that Miles will read his romance; he is merely hoping good reports of it will reach "Raincien" so that Miles may learn of it. Once more then, he is very obviously not addressing himself to a patron, but rather making a bid for patronage.

The dedication contains another indication damaging to Mr. V.'s dating. Renart wishes "ses pris et ses renons" to go to Milon "en Raincien." The passage must, consequently, have been written at a time when Miles was still in residence at Rheims, that is, not later than 1218. This point was established by Mme Lejeune,⁹ but Mr. V. has attempted to circumvent it.¹⁰ Mme Lejeune, he says, is supposing that after his installation in the see of Beauvais Miles never again set foot in Rheims, whereas actually he must have had more than one occasion to return there and it is definitely known that he was there in 1228. That Miles did visit

⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 74-77.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 81-82.

¹⁰ *RR.*, xxviii, 110.

Rheims after having assumed his episcopacy is, of course, evident—so evident, in fact, that I cannot believe Mme Lejeune ever thought otherwise. The point is, however, that the character of the passage in question is such that a temporary sojourn in Rheims will not suffice to explain it. Renart does not say he is sending his work itself to Milon; he merely wishes that it may become favorably known at Rheims so Miles will learn of it. This indicates not only that Miles was at the time in Rheims, but also that the poet expected him to remain there indefinitely. With Mr. V.'s dating of the poem rejected, we must fall back upon that of Mme Lejeune, who with painstaking and sound scholarship seems to have attained as much precision and trustworthiness as is possible in this matter.

III. In 1933 Mr. V., having discovered a clerk Piaudoue named in documents dating from the second half of the thirteenth century, concluded,¹¹ first, that this Piaudoue was one with the Piaudoue who figures in the *tenson De Renart et de Piaudoue*¹² and, second, that the *tenson* itself, together with its companion piece, *le Plait Renart de Dammartin contre Vairon, son roncin*,¹³ was written in the neighborhood of 1260. Mme Lejeune has accepted implicitly the first conclusion;¹⁴ I have done so with reservations.¹⁵ Both Mme Lejeune and I, however, have rejected 1260 as the date of the two *tensons*. She believes they were written between 1235 and 1250;¹⁶ I believe they were written still earlier.

Now Mr. V. has found a fresh trace of his Piaudoue, which he considers justification for assigning to the two poems an even later date than the one he first proposed.¹⁷ He has discovered that Piaudoue relinquished his parish of Vernonnet in 1267 and believes the reason for this action was that the clerk was forced thereto because of misconduct of the same nature as that with which Renart taxes him in the *tenson*. A passage in the *tenson*, which Mme Lejeune interprets as indicating that Piaudoue was not yet invested with priesthood, Mr. V. feels indicates rather that the clerk had been shorn of this dignity. Hence the two *tensons* must have been written after 1267.

In regard to the passage of *De Renart et de Piaudoue* just men-

¹¹ *MP.*, xxx, 257-61.

¹² Ed. R. Lejeune, *op. cit.*, pp. 411-23.

¹³ Ed. R. Lejeune, *op. cit.*, pp. 407-10.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 391.

¹⁵ *MP.*, xxxii, 349-50.

¹⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 392-96.

¹⁷ *MLN.*, liv, 265-66.

tioned (xxvii, 1-3), let us first remark that the conclusions of neither Mme Lejeune nor Mr. V. are justified. It is impossible to say with any degree of certainty whether the verses were addressed to one aspiring to priesthood, to one invested with it, or to one fallen from that state. Let us say further that linguistic considerations seem to rule out the dates proposed by Mr. V. Not only does Renart's own language seem to indicate that his life did not extend very far into the thirteenth century,¹⁸ but one of the tensons itself shows the etymological forms of the possessives *tuens* and *suens* in rime with *buens* and *cuens*.¹⁹ Since the analogical forms had triumphed in the regions north of the Ile de France by 1250, it can hardly be supposed that the tensons, which show certain Picard characteristics,²⁰ were written after that date, especially in view of the fact that the writer—unless Mme Lejeune is correct in supposing this to have been Renart himself²¹—was apparently a young man.

Mme Lejeune has fixed 1235 as a *terminus a quo*²² for the two poems on the ground that a man as old as Renart is represented in them to be could not have composed the *Lai de l'Ombre*, which she agrees with Mr. V. was written in the neighborhood of 1220. The notion that the age of writers necessarily reflects itself in their work is, of course, entirely without foundation. One might cite any number—among them Milton, Voltaire, Goethe, Hugo—who produced their best works in their declining years.

I think we may get somewhere nearer the true date of our two poems by considering vss. 51-60 of the *Plait*. Vairon taunts Renart:

52

. . . or sont li doneor et mort et recreü.

Mme Lejeune believes this is an allusion to Milon de Nanteuil.²³ It is to be remarked, however, that *doneor* is plural; the author of the tenson, then, was alluding to more than one of Renart's benefactors. There is to be noted too the term *recreü*. This may have been applied to Milon, but might much more aptly have been used of another person believed to have accorded favor to Renart, that is, his fellow townsman, Renaud de Dammartin, the vanquished hero of

¹⁸ Cf. *MP.*, xxxii, 350-51.

¹⁹ *Le Plait Renart contre Vairon*, vss. 57-60. Mme Lejeune has not noted this trait in her study of the language of the two poems.

²⁰ Cf. Lejeune, *op. cit.*, p. 399.

²² *Op. cit.*, p. 393.

²¹ *Op. cit.*, 403-6.

²³ *Op. cit.*, p. 393.

Bouvines.²⁴ Still another who we have reason to think was particularly generous to our poet is Renaud's kinsman Thibaut de Bar,²⁵ to whom Renart may very well have been presented by Renaud. Thibaut could hardly have been called *recreü*, but then we need not suppose that both epithets, that is, *mort* and *recreü*, applied to each of the two or more "givers" the author of the *Plait* had in mind. By the same token, if we are correct in thinking that Renaud was one of the givers alluded to, we need not suppose that he was already dead.

So far, of course, we are treading on very unfirm ground, but let us see what Renart replies to his nag. He indignantly gives him the lie and boasts of bounty from the king of France (vss. 53-56). This, although the fact seems not yet to have been recognized, is obviously ironical. The author of the *tenson* is thrusting at Renart a gibe whose sting must lie in the fact that Renart can expect no favor from the king—doubtless because he has been under the protection of the king's enemies. Hence Vairon's surprise:

57

Vous done dont li rois?

Renart goes on to name other benefactors (vss. 57-60), and the irony continues, for these are manifestly not true protectors but persons whose favor Renart had unsuccessfully solicited. Not one of them is mentioned in the other *tenson*; there, on the contrary, Renart is represented as being completely dependent for his existence upon a certain Bouteiller (xxviii, 4-12).²⁶

The things we have just considered point to the period just following Bouvines as that in which our two *tensons* were composed. It must be admitted, however, that so far we have adduced nothing in itself very conclusive. Fortunately Renart himself comes to our aid in the opening verses of the *Lai de l'Ombre*. Mme Lejeune has recognized that the poet here alludes to his own situation and she sums up that situation: ²⁷

Qu'est-ce à dire, sinon que Jean Renart commente ici son cas personnel d'homme un peu déchu, ayant perdu un protecteur, démuné d'argent, mais qui a foi en sa chance et en sa courtoisie, et qui se défend devant des concurrents, affirmant que lorsqu'on abandonne sa "folie," on peut retrouver sa situation primitive.

²⁴ Cf. Lejeune, *op. cit.*, pp. 102-5.²⁵ Cf. Lejeune, *op. cit.*, p. 394-95.²⁶ Cf. Lejeune, *op. cit.*, pp. 110-11.²⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 252-53.

Now is this not precisely the picture of Renart given us by the *tensons*? The latter must, then, have been composed just before the *Lai* or at about the same time.

But this is not all. Renart seems to allude in the *Lai* to the *tensons* themselves. At any rate he indicates that he has been an object of attack and reprimands his detractors:

4 Je ne vueil pas resambler ceus
 Qui sont garçon por tout destruire,
 Quar, puis que j'ai le sens d'estruire
 Aucun bien en dit ou en fet,
 Vilains est qui ses gas en fet,
 Se ma cortoisie s'aoevre
 A fere aucune plesant oeuvre
 Ou il n'ait ramposne ne lait.
 Fols est qui por parole lait
 Bien a dire, por qu'il le sache;
 Et s'aucuns fel sa langue en sache
 Par derriere, tout ce li doit . . .

While I feel that the precise dates assigned to the *Lai* by Mr. V.²⁸ and Mme Lejeune²⁹ are subject to caution, there can be little doubt that the composition of the poem fell somewhere between 1217 and 1222. Thus, proceeding by another route, we again find our *tensons* falling into the period following Bouvines.

Renart's career may now be pieced out something like this: At the close of the twelfth century, already no longer young, he makes a bid for the protection of Baldwin of Flanders by dedicating to him the *Escoufle*. In this, however, he is either unsuccessful or the benefits derived therefrom are short-lived because of Baldwin's departure for the Crusades. Then Renart seems to have gained the protection of Renaud de Dammartin and in all probability accompanied the latter to the court of his cousin, Thibaut de Bar, who seems likewise to have shown the poet favor. Meanwhile Renart attempts to win the good will of the rising young churchman, Milon de Nanteuil, by dedicating to him *Guillaume de Dole*. Apparently the maneuver is unsuccessful. The death of Thibaut and the defeat of Renaud at Bouvines leave Renart without influential friends. His former connection with Renaud makes it difficult for him to find new protectors. He has been extravagant and now finds himself in want. Envious rivals taunt him with his

²⁸ *MP.*, xxx (1933), 351-59.

²⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 246-57.

age and misfortune. With the *Lai de l'Ombre*, he makes a fresh attempt to win the patronage of Milon, recently named to the see of Beauvais. In the meantime he seems to have gained the support of one of the royal butlers of Senlis, doubtless Gui IV.

V. FREDERIC KOENIG

The University of Arizona

RASSISCH-NATIONALE STILKUNDE

Der fremdländische und der seiner Heimat entfremdete, deutsche Forscher, sie sind allzuleicht geneigt, über halb- oder pseudowissenschaftliche Leistungen des heutigen Deutschland einfach zur Tagesordnung überzugehen. Damit werden aber zwei Geistesdialekte in ihrer unüberbrückbaren Differenz anerkannt und belassen. So sei es dem Stilforscher gestattet, eine neuere Stiluntersuchung *kritisch* zu beleuchten. Der Aufsatz, betitelt "Nationale Sinnbilder und lyrische Sprachgestaltung," von Edgar Glässer, steht in der "Neuphilologischen Monatsschrift" (Leipzig, Dez. 1937). Er stellt zwei Gedichte, Vigny's "Le cor" und Wildenbruch's "Siegfrieds Blut," als nationale Ausprägungen lyrischer Gestaltung einander gegenüber. Als rassische Gemeinsamkeit wird eine gemeinsame überpersönliche "nordische" Symbolik herausgearbeitet, die einer "platonisch-plotinischen" Logosmystik entstamme: das Horn als Sinnbild des ewigen Vermächtnisses heldischen Opfergeistes an Roncevaux schicksalhaft gekettet bei Vigny, die Wolke des ungesühnten Siegfriedblutes über dem Odenwald schwebend bei Wildenbruch. Der nationale *Unterschied* zwischen den beiden lyrischen Haltungen beruhe in der humanistisch-universalistischen Verherrlichung des Heldentums *an sich* durch den Franzosen, der patriotisch-nationalen des deutschen Helden durch den Deutschen, wobei dann des letzteren Symbolik "enger, umgrenzter — kunstmässig gesehen —" sei. Ein letzter Abschnitt bei Glässer bemängelt nicht mehr nur mit stil-, sondern mit politisch-kritischen Argumenten die "hohenzollerndeutsche" unvolkhafte Form dieses Wildenbruchschen Patriotismus, in dem Siegfried-Deutschland als "Riese von Leib, aber von Kopf und Herzen ein Kind" erscheint, das Tücke und Neid erliegt. Schon die blosse Inhaltsangabe wird die Brüchigkeit und innere Wider-

sprüchlichkeit dieses Aufsatzes klargemacht haben. Sollen nationale Stilprägungen festgestellt werden, ist nur Gleichwertiges zu vergleichen, eine Vergleichung eines französischen vollkommenen Kunstwerkes mit einem missglückten, obskuren deutschen Machwerk (das Verfasser abdrucken musste weil es "nicht in dem gleichen Masse zugänglich sei") könnte doch offenbar nur missgünstige Folgerungen über deutsche Dichtung hervorrufen.: Glässer, der diesen Bärenienst deutscher Dichtung leistet, muss selbst "einen gewissen künstlerischen Gradunterschied" wenigstens in der Wirkung der Symbolik beider Gedichte zugestehen: der Hornruf Rolands ist ein wirklich historisch-legendarisch beglaubigter Anruf des Helden an die—stummbleibende—Mitwelt gewesen, die Blutwolke über dem Odenwald ist eine wurzellose, willkürliche Erfindung des um Blutsühne besorgten, gegen den Geist des Verrats im deutschen Volk eifernden Preussendichters. Rolands Hornruf haftet wirklich an Roncevaux, so dass der Dichter und sein Leser sie hören müssen; die Blutwolke hat ein findiger Theatermacher, die gängige Metapher "blutrote Wolke" szenisch materialisierend, über den Odenwald hingekleckst. Die Kunst Vigny's in den vielbewunderten sieben Eingangsstrophen besteht in dem allmählichen Singenmachen der lokalen Erinnerungen, in dem Neuerwecken des ewigen Rolandrufes, in der Überführung der persönlich-träumerischen Dichter-Meditation in epische Herausbeschwörung des "ungetrösteten Schattens" des gescheiterten Helden. Über die Beschaffenheit der lyrischen Zauberkraft Wildenbruchs gibt gleich seine 1. Strophe Auskunft:

Wenn Du *nun* kommst an den Odenwald
Eine Wolke *da* wirst du sehen,
Die wird regungslos und wie rotes Blut
Über den Bergen stehen.

Die verräterisch gedankenlosen, holperigen und unpoetischen "*nun*" und "*da*" beweisen schon die missglückte Incantatio: statt die Blutwolke an uns heranzuzaubern, wird sie vor uns gewaltsam wie ein Theaterrequisit aufgepflanzt. Durch das "*nun*" stolpern wir unvermittelt in medias res, das "*da*" fesselt den Blick vorzeitig an Unglaubhaftes. Sprachliche Ungeschicklichkeit verrät stets mangelnde Ergriffenheit des Dichters: fast ist es schauerlich, bei diesem deutschtümelnden Dichter—einen jüdelnden Tonfall zu entdecken! Ich sehe voraus, dass Glässer mit dem in

echt-Nordischem wurzelnden Volksliedton auftrumpfen wird, der auch in der bänkelsängerhaften 2. Strophe anklingt:

Denn im Odenwald, *das weisst Du ja,*
Schlugen den Siegfried sie tot,
Die rote Wolke, *das ist sein Blut,*
Das noch heute zum Himmel loht—

aber, erinnere ich mich nicht dass gerade R. Wagner es war, der dem Intellektuellen Heine seine volkstümelnde "Bänkelsängerpoesie" vorwarf? Was gegen Heine recht ist, ist auch gegen Wildenbruch billig: wo bleibt in dem Leierkastenton die nordische Mythosatmosphäre?

Aber der künstlerischen Gravamina gegen die 11 Strophen des deutschen Gedichtes sind noch viel mehr: der Symbolismus Vigny's schwingt schwer und träumerisch traurig in der Landschaft, der Dichter gibt keine Erklärung mit einem "id est," während Wildenbruch platt seine eigene Allegorese—im Grunde ist es das, nicht Symbolik—ausdeutet und dem Leser, vorwegnehmend, dreinredet: "Die rote Wolke, *das ist sein Blut*" und später: "Wolke von Siegfrieds, von Deutschlands Blut," mit arithmetischer Gleichsetzung Siegfried-Deutschland. Ist solche Klugschwätzerei am Poetischen deutsch? Glässer, der unaufrichtige Kommentator,¹ muss das Unpoetische dieses Selbstgedeuteten seines 'Dichters' gemerkt haben: wie soll man sonst erklären, dass er gerade die banal rechtenden, unlyrischen, unsymbolischen Strophen nicht abgedruckt hat (die Berufung auf das "dem Verständnis Notwendige" kann nicht ernst sein—kann man in einem wahrhaften Gedicht verständnisnotwendige und- unnötige Teile sondern?)? Ich setze sie her:

¹ Glässer schreibt: "Finden wir bei Vigny die Schallsymbolik verwendet, so wird sich uns entsprechend bei Wildenbruch die Lichtsymbolik offenbaren"—es sollte noch gesagt werden dass die Blutwolke bei diesem statisch-dumpf wie eine unveränderliche Theatersonne alten Stils "regungslos" stehen bleibt, dieselbe bleibt—während bei Vigny der Hornruf eine äussere und innere Entwicklung hat (ist nicht der deutsche Dichter sonst "Werdedichter," der romanische "Seinsrealist"?); aber es ist auch nicht wahr, dass Vigny bloss Schälle, Wildenbruch Licht verwendet (die Konsequenzen für die Nationalstile zieht hier Glässer übrigens nicht)—denn Vigny hat, wie ich s. Z. in meinen "Romanischen Stil- und Literaturstudien" nachwies, Schall- und Lichtsymbolik zugleich (*sombre vallée—l'écume les [les chevaux] blanchit—les feux mourants du jour—roche noire*, auch eine Flammenwolke, die den blutigen Tod der Paladine aufzeigt, fehlt nicht), mit Vorwiegen der ersteren.

- 3 Denn Siegfried, das war der herrliche Held,
Wie ihn Deutschland nur einmal gebär—
Torheit und Niedertracht brachten ihn um,
Weil er ein Deutscher war. . . .
- 5 Töricht in Liebe verriet ihn darum
Kriemhild, das deutsche Weib,
Raufte ihr Haar, als zu spät es war,
Über des Toten Leib.
- 6 Schmähhlich in Schwäche verriet ihn darum
Gunther der Königsman,,
Weil ihm das fremde Weib es befahl,
Gab er den Deutschen daran . . .
- 8 Denn was vor tausend Jahren geschah,
Tut man in Deutschland *noch jetzt*,
Dass man das treue Heldenblut
Schmähhlich hetzt.
- 9 Heut noch über dem deutschen Land
Waltet der Fremden Gebot,
Seine Kinder bewerfen noch heut
Die eigene Mutter mit Kot.

Glässer sagt: "Das Gedicht ist datiert: Heidelberg, Johannistag 1904" d. h. dass das Gedicht von vornherein auf eine groteske historische Unwahrheit gegründet ist; ("Heut [1904!] noch über dem deutschen Land . . .") und ferner, dass der Dichter nichts getan hat, um das Motiv des Johannisfeuers mit dem Gedichtmotiv innerlich zu verbinden. Seine innere Unergriffenheit zeigt sich darin, 1) dass der Dichter alles getan hat, um durch seine rhetorischen *heut noch, noch heut* jedes sanfte Übergehen von Erinnerung in Vision zu zerstören, 2) dass seine unaufhörlichen Kausalanknüpfungen (*weil, darum*) uns in eine ganz unlyrische Verstandes- und Ironiewelt hineinführen, eine polemisch-moralpädagogische These beweisen, dass nämlich Deutschsein Verraten heisst, im Gegensatz zu Vigny, der den Verrat nur als Möglichkeit andeutet ("Il [Karl der Grosse] craint la trahison").

Wir geraten in die politische Rügeschriftstellerei eines Heine oder Börne hinein, die Raunewelt des Mythos ist längst vertrieben. Vigny's Haltung ist nicht nur menschlich-vornehmer—weil sie nicht bestimmte Mächte der Schuld am Tod seines Helden anklagt—, sie ist nicht nur menscheitsbedacht, weil sie humanistisch-universalistisch ist, was in einer cartesianisch-helleren Wertwelt noch immer höher steht als national-patriotisch,—sie ist auch poetisch rein, weil sie nicht Satire und Rügelied mit lyrischer Evocation epischen

Geschehens vermischt, weil sie ein tragisches Schicksal—den Tod des Helden in der Welt—nicht kurzfristig bestimmten Kräften zuschreibt, sondern sie als eine höhergesetzliche Notwendigkeit erscheinen lässt, die durch eine andere Gesetzlichkeit, die des erlösenden Nachruhms, übergriffen und verklärt wird. Nicht bloss die geringe Volksverbundenheit des Hohenzollerndichters ist schuld an dem dichterischen Fehlschlag, sondern der Mangel an metaphysischer Fernsicht, die plump zugreifende Tüppischkeit und Absichtlichkeit. Wie konnte an so untauglichem Objekt unternommen werden, ein deutsches "nationales Sinnbild" lyrischer Sprachgestaltung aufzuweisen? Glässer hat, rein methodisch gesprochen, sich, wie ältere positivistisch gesinnte Stilforscher, von dem Was der dichterischen Motivik (Hornruf-Blutwolke, beide an einem Orte haftend—diese Stoffübereinstimmung ist offenbar sein Ansatzpunkt gewesen) betören lassen, statt dem Wie nachzugehen. Eine lyrische Evokation episch-legendarischer Vorgänge ist mit einem legendär verbrämten politischen Schimpflied inkommensurabel: wo findet man bei Vigny solch unlyrische, banal-ungeformte Wendungen wie: "Torheit und Niedertracht brachten ihn um, weil er ein Deutscher war," "dass man das deutsche Heldenblut schimpflich zu Tode hetzt" "bewerfen noch heut die eigene Mutter mit Kot"??

Wenn Wildenbruch ein nationales Sinnbild lyrischer Sprachgestaltung sein soll, dann sind Unkunst, Drastik, unmetaphysische Schimpflust, engstirniger Nationalismus, intellektueller Mythologismus, falscher Volkston *deutsch*—quod non erat demonstrandum!²

Eine unfreiwillige Ironie hat es gefügt, dass Glässer als Parallele zu Wildenbruchs "Sehen" der Wolke über dem Odenwald das Sehen und Hören des "rhetorischen Politikers" Mussolini gesellt: "Ma dalle Alpi bianchi di neve e vermiglie di sangue il grido è stato udito"—jawohl, Wildenbruch ist ein rhetorischer Politiker, der die Fertigfabrikate der politischen Tribüne mit dichterischem Bilden verwechselt!

Bei der Aufnordung des französischen Romantikers, die die Ras-

² Überhaupt sollte der Stilforscher, der deutsche mit sonstiger Dichtung vergleicht, darauf achten, dass wir Deutsche an lyrische Poesie einen weniger strengen Massstab anlegen, als im allgemeinen Romanen und Engländer. R. Musil hat in seiner Rilke-Rede mit der zweitrangigen deutschen Lyrik mutig abgerechnet und zwischen Goethe und Rilke ein Vacuum festgestellt.

sengemeinschaft Vigny-Wildenbruch stützen soll, kann man sich nicht lange aufhalten: wer in Vigny's melancholisch sanftem Hornruf ein "an germanischen Walhallmythus und Wodanskult gemahnendes Sinnbild des ewigen Vermächtnisses heldischen Opfergeistes" hören kann, der muss auch in Petrarca's "Africa" und in aller Rom- und Ruinenpoesie die Hufe des Wodansheeres vernehmen. Und da doch der Gegenspieler des Nordischen offenbar der semitische Geist ist, so wäre man begierig, die—nirgends versuchte—Abhebung von althebräischem Heldensang und Babylontrauer zu erleben. An die Stelle überprüfbarer Beweise für aperçu-hafte Typisierungen schiebt sich ein selbstverständlichtuendes "Bekanntlich."

Dass bei einer so grobschlächtigen national-differentiellen Stilistik das Ungleiche gleichmacherisch eingegeben werden muss, ist vorauszusehen. Da sollen z. B. die beiden Fragen

Âmes des Chevaliers, revenez-vous encore?
Est-ce vous qui parlez avec la voix du cor?
Roncevaux! Roncevaux! dans ta sombre vallée
L'ombre du grand Roland n'est donc pas consolée?

und:

Wolke von Siegfrieds, von Deutschlands Blut,
Die keine Stürme verwehen,
Blutmal über dem Odenwald,
Willst du niemals, niemals vergehen?

Gestaltungen "mit der rhetorisch-mahnenden kontemplativen Frage sein," bei denen "der Redende über die staunende Betrachtung einer Tatsache nicht hinausgeht." "Rhetorisch" ist offenbar die deutsche, "kontemplativ" die französische Stelle, nicht sind beide zusammen rhetorisch-kontemplativ (was ja eine Contradictio wäre): der französische Dichter spricht die Frage sanft betroffen zu sich selbst im Augenblicke da aus der Hornruf-Träumerei seine Vision entsteht, im Augenblick der Unsicherheit zwischen lyrischer Meditation und epischem Schauen, während der preussische Dichter mit der kopfschüttelnd-entrüsteten Frage ein dynamisch-drastisches Gedicht ungeduldig (*niemals, niemals*) abschliesst. Wie kann der Stilforscher so "grammatikalistisch" am Buchstaben, in diesem Fall an der Interpunktion (dem Fragezeichen) kleben?

Wenn die Todesweise Rolands wie die des Wolfs bei Vigny "eddisch"-stoisch ist, so sehe ich nicht ab, wie die griechisch-römische Stoa der Aufnordnung entgehen kann.

Wenn vollends in der Racine-Stelle "Voyage infortuné! Rivage malheureux! Fallait-il approcher de tes bords dangereux!" eine magisch-fatalistische "Schicksalsbindung an einen bestimmten Ort, der das Sinnbild der Wiedererinnerung darstellt,"³ auch im Norden beheimatet sein soll und wenn dieser Fatalismus vom Jansenismus her stammt, wie Verfasser will, dann wird offenbar auch diese letztere Richtung, als französisches Analogon zu deutschem Protestantismus, "nordisch annektiert."

So scheint Nordisch ein allüberflutendes und allverschlingendes Sammelbecken zu werden, in dem Preziosität⁴ wie der sie überwindende Klassizismus, Romantik wie Klassik ihre Wasser vermischen. Wenn die dynamisch sich wandelnde und vertiefende Symbolik Vigny's, dieses Bedeutungsverleihen an den Laut (Todesruf des Helden-Anruf der Welt) in irgend einem Kulturklima—ein Rassenklima lässt sich ja nicht ausfindig machen—beheimatet ist, so höchstens—wie auch die ähnliche Flauberts (man denke an das Brautbukett Emma Bovarys und den Zaïmph Salammbô's), in dem des *Christentums*, das z. B. in der "Wandlung" belanglose Dinge mit höchster Wirkungskraft ausstatten kann. Die Blutwolke Wildenbruchs ist Theaternebel, keiner Transsubstantiation fähig—sie wird ewig "unerlöst" über dem Odenwald hangen. Wenn es schon etwas wie "westlich-gallische Bravour" gibt, so hätte ich gedacht, dass Zeilen wie die folgenden, die an die Beredsamkeit des Corneille'schen "Cid" erinnern:

Il (Roland) rugit comme un tigre et dit: "Si je me rends,
Africain, ce sera lorsque les Pyrénées
Sur l'onde avec leurs corps rouleront entraînées."

.

oder: (der Maure sagt, indem er einen Stein auf Roland wälzt:) "Rends-toi donc, répond-il, ou meurs, *car les voilà* (sc. les Pyrénées)"—"Merci, cria Roland; *tu m'as fait un chemin*," der Kritik des Edda-Nordlings verfallen müssten. Aber nein—il y a des accommodements avec le ciel—de Walhalla.

³ Sind die romantischen Orte, die *Mort Homme*, *Ome morto* (Italien), *Homem morto* (Portugal) heissen und einen Mord an einem Menschen durch ihren Namen verewigen, auch nordisch?

⁴ Glässer hat (*Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie*, 1934, Sp. 326) allen Ernstes die französische Preziosität des 17. Jahrhunderts als "späte, raum-zeit-gestaltlich abgewandelte Ausformung der Nordgesinnung" angesprochen, die sich in Gothik, Barock, Rococo, Romantik zeige. Fehlt nur das "dunkle Dichten" und die *gaia scienza* der Provenzalen!

Zusammenfassend lässt sich sagen dass Glässer, in bewährten stilistischen Methoden wohlbewandert, die verglichenen Objekte durch Herantragen so lockerer Kategorien wie "nordische Gesinnung" zurechtstutzt und die Methode der Vergleichung (mehr des motivischen Was als des künstlerischen Wie) so parteiisch handhabt, dass der Eindruck der Vergleichbarkeit und künstlerischen Gleichwertigkeit entsteht. Charles Dubos in seinem schönen Aufsatz "La notion de littérature et la beauté du langage" ("Approximations," VII) geht von dem Longinus-Wort aus: "Die schönen Worte sind wahrhaftig das eigene und natürliche Licht unserer Gedanken" und zeichnet das Streben der Gedanken zum "repos dans la lumière": "Toutes les fois où sur un texte se pose cette couronne de la beauté, l'on peut être certain que, quelle que soit la nature de son contenu, le texte appartient aux belles-lettres. La littérature, c'est la pensée, accédant à la beauté dans la lumière. Mais, en même temps qu'elle le couronne de sa beauté, la présence de la lumière dans un texte est le signe que la pensée est vraiment née au jour: son absence, l'indice qu'elle n'est pas toute dégagée des limbes de la gestation, et, en deça d'être vraiment née au jour, pas davantage une pensée n'appartient aux belles lettres."

"Siegfrieds Blut" gehört, weder gedanklich noch sprachlich ausgereift, nicht in den Bereich der belles-lettres. Vigny's "Le cor" trägt an sich die sichtlichen Zeichen der dichterischen Begnadung.: die Lichtkrone des *schönen* wortgewordenen Gedankens.

Stilvergleichung aber soll nur unternehmen eine lautere, dem Schönen sicher und sanft erschlossene Seele, die das Licht der dichterischen Gnade vom Dunkel des Chaotischen und Vorkünstlerischen zu scheiden weiss. Das Schöne und die Kunde vom Schönen müssen "in sich selig" sein. Politisierte Stilkunde, garstige Kunde!⁵

⁵ Hier möchte ich den durch politische Parteierung skrupellos gewordenen Glässer festnageln, der behauptet, dass Friedrich Schürz das "Leitmotiv vom Hornklang" erkannt hat und die durchaus "unangemessene Auffassung eines Spitzer" durch die verdienstliche Feststellung beseitigt habe, "dass der Ton des Hornes nicht als unepischer Bericht über einen zweckhaften Hilferuf, sondern als lyrischer Ausdruck eines heldischen Sinngehaltes aufzufassen ist." Ich stelle fest, dass ich in "Romanische Stil- & Literaturstudien" II die Thematik des Gedichts, nach summarischen Andeutungen Roustan's und Fubini's, im Einzelnen nachgewiesen habe, was Schürz selbst ("Neuere Sprachen" 1933, S. 251) zugibt. Schürz betont mehr als ich die heldische Pflichterfüllung des Ausharrens an verlorenem

Wenn National- und "Rassengefühl" die *Liebe zur Dichtung* abzustumpfen imstande sind, so ist wirklich der höhere Wert dem niederen geopfert worden: denn beim Nationalgefühl ist, neben dem Gefühl des Aufgehens des Einzelnen im Volksganzen, auch eine naive Selbstverherrlichung des primitiven Seins ("mein Volk ist gross, also auch ich") mitgegeben, während die Liebe zum Schönen nur den edelsten und selbstlosesten Teil des Einzelichs aufruft. Der Irrtum des Stilkritikers, der humanitär-universalistische Literaturwerte mit national-patriotischen auf *eine* Stufe stellt, beruht auf derselben Werte-Verwirrung wie der, die ihn nationale mit künstlerischen Werten verwechseln lässt: Grillparzers herbes Wort ("von Humanität durch Nationalität zu Bestialität"—Rassischkeit war damals noch nicht vorhersehbar) gestattet, Kunst und Afterkunst zu scheiden: eine inhumane Kunst und eine inhumane Kunstbetrachtung sind Widersprüche, die sich selbst aufheben.

LEO SPITZER

The Johns Hopkins University

FAVRAS AND HUGO'S MARIE TUDOR

While it is more than probable that Hugo found some of the inspiration for *Marie Tudor*¹ in the *Christine* of Dumas père,² with its similar "triangle" of queen, favorite, and executioner,³ he can have drawn on it only for the first *journée* and part of the second. The resemblance ceases at the point where the queen

Posten, ich hatte, im Hinblick auf die zweimalige Erwähnung des *appel*, des Hornrufs, das tragische Unterbleiben der Verständigung des Helden mit der Welt (das doch auch in dem epischen Teil dargestellt ist) hervorgehoben; Pflichterfüllung ist doch mit Heldentum gegeben! Nur böser Wille kann einen "zweckhaften Hilferuf" dem "Heldischen" gegenüberstellen. Schliesslich ist diesen neudeutschen, sehr irdisch zweckhaft vorgehenden ultraheroischen Ideologen, die 'out-roland Roland' möchten, zu sagen, dass Roland, weniger heldisch als ihre Ideologie es will, doch tatsächlich um Hilfe *gerufen hat*.

"Dieu! que le son du cor est triste au fond des bois! "

¹ First performed Nov. 7, 1833, at the Porte-Saint-Martin.

² First performed Feb. 25, 1830. See Edmond Biré, *Victor Hugo après 1830*, Paris, Perrin, 1891, I, 108 ff.

³ Named as such by Hugo in the preface to *Marie Tudor*. Hugo, *Oeuvres complètes*, Imprimerie Nationale, Théâtre, III, 1904, p. 7.

delivers her favorite to the executioner.⁴ From there on, *Marie Tudor* becomes the story of her vain attempt to save, especially by a trick of substitution, a man whose death is willed by the people.

Not only is there nothing of the sort in *Christine*, but this second action of *Marie Tudor* is so opposite to that of the first part that with all due allowance for the generating power of antithesis in Hugo's imagination it is still difficult to find an adequate organic relationship; the second action can perhaps be explained as resulting from the first, but if there is a central idea governing the play as a whole it is unusually obscure.⁵ Indeed, Hugo seems to have been uncertain as to his own intention, for the manuscript of the play reveals that he reversed the original outcome, not under pressure from actors or public, but evidently as an almost immediate reconsideration.

If Hugo saw *Favras* presented at the Gaîté in 1831,⁶ this second plot-action is thoroughly accounted for, as well as the highly revolutionary tone of *Marie Stuart* and perhaps the character of the Queen. He could not have failed to know of the play in the small theatrical world of the 1830's; he could have read it; everything in his interests and associations with the theater at this period would support the evidence of *Marie Tudor* that he saw it.

Favras, épisode de 1789, in three acts, by MM. Merville and T. Sauvage,⁷ is basically historical, though with fictional complications:

The marquis of Favras is accused of high treason, but is too loyal to his superiors to present the evidence that might save him. The court, disposed to believe him innocent, is overawed by a mob which is incited by two unscrupulous plotters, Turcati and Morel. The actual leader of the mob, and the most striking figure of the play, is Théroigne de Méricourt, who is moved not only by her own instinctive sympathy with the people, but by her resentment that a noble might escape conviction while the man she loves, Marcel, is in prison. Under her influence, and fearing mob violence, the court sentences Favras to be hanged. The marquise de Favras connives with several men for her husband's escape; Marcel, who does not wish to spend a life in prison separated from Théroigne, volunteers to die for him.

⁴ End of *Journée II*.

⁵ Cf. discussion by A. Vitu, *Les Mille et une nuits du théâtre*, Paris, Ollendorff, 1885, II, 198 ff. Based on the performance of 1873.

⁶ First performed May 19.

⁷ Paris, aux magasins de pièces de théâtre, 1831. Imprimerie Chassaignon.

When Théroigne brings him hope of eventual escape, he revolts against his sacrifice, but finally decides to keep his word, and leaves his money with the Marquise to be given to Théroigne after his death. At the last moment his heroic action is thwarted, and it is the Marquis who is executed, the failure of the plan being shown to the Marquise and to the audience by the reappearance of Marcel a moment after the execution.

Thus in *Favras*, as in *Marie Tudor*, a man is condemned by the official judgment of legal authority, but would go free if it were not for the threat of mob violence. In *Favras* the mob invades the stage,⁸ while in *Marie Tudor* it remains offstage,⁹ but in each play the scene of intimidation by the mob is given in full, and the sentence is read to the mob to pacify it. This sentence, in each play, states that the prisoner is to carry in his hand *une torche de cire jaune*,¹⁰ a requirement of the Church, but one not often explicitly named on the stage. In both plays the execution is at night, a fact favoring the attempt to substitute another man. Hugo adds a black veil to cover the condemned man; there is nothing of the sort in *Favras*, but a man in black has a conspicuous part in the fatal procession.

There is no resemblance of character in the men condemned to die, and not a close one between their substitutes. Marcel volunteers to die for the marquis de Favras; Gilbert has no intention of dying for Fabiani but offers to give his life, for a price, in doing whatever the Queen commands. In thus offering their lives, Marcel is inspired partly and Gilbert wholly by despair at the loss of the woman each loves:

Marcel: Grâce! une détention perpétuelle! Quelle grâce! J'aimerais autant . . . j'aimerais mieux mourir. Languir des années, des siècles, dans leurs prisons . . . Deux années dans leurs cachots infects, les angoisses d'une procédure, d'un jugement . . . séparé d'elle, de celle que j'aime. Pauvre Théroigne! (*F.*, II, 2)

Gilbert: Ma mort. Qu'entends-tu par ce mot? Ma mort, c'est que Jane ne m'aime plus. Du jour où je n'ai plus été aimé, j'ai été mort. . . . Il y a une chose certaine, c'est que je voudrais mourir. (*M. T.*, III, 1, 1)

In each play there is one unsuccessful attempt to rescue the condemned man directly from prison.¹¹ It is in a night scene at the

⁸ Act II, scenes 16-19.

⁹ *Journée* III, part 1, scene 9.

¹⁰ *Favras*, II, 19; *Marie Tudor*, III, 1, 9.

¹¹ *Favras*, II, 9-10; *Marie Tudor*, III, 1, 7-8.

Châtelet, near the prisoners' cells, that Mme de Favras consults with the duc de Penthièvre and an official as to the means of saving her husband; it is in a night scene at the Tower of London, near the cells, that Mary demands that Maître Énéas find a way to save Fabiani.¹² Though the sequence of events is different, there is in each play a scene where the man who has been willing to die threatens to upset all plans by a change of heart:

Marcel: Madame . . . ma pauvre chère dame . . . j'en suis bien fâché . . . mais . . . j'ai fait des réflexions. . . .

Mme de Favras: Grand dieu! vous refuseriez-vous maintenant?

Marcel: Que voulez-vous? J'ai appris une chose qui change terriblement . . . les affaires. (*F.*, III, 10)

Gilbert: Je ne suis plus décidé à mourir, madame.

La Reine: Comment!

Gilbert: Tenez, majesté, j'ai réfléchi toute la nuit. Rien ne m'est prouvé dans cette affaire. (*M. T.*, II, 3)

As the condition of Marcel's sacrifice, the marquise de Favras must not only give a considerable sum of money to Théroigne, but must promise to give all possible affection, advice, and protection to the woman she holds largely responsible for her husband's conviction. She is willing to give the money, hesitates to promise to love her enemy, and finally consents.¹³ Queen Mary, asked to pay for the right to dispose of Gilbert's life, offers money freely but is overwhelmed on finding that the full condition, which she has sworn to fulfill, involves restoring Jane's rank and estates and marrying her to Fabiani.¹⁴ Hugo has constructed a more paradoxical situation than that of *Favras*, but its basis is similar: the woman must aid her natural adversary to purchase the man's life. Marcel has also a second condition, which in *Marie Tudor* is reduced to a passing suggestion:

Marcel: . . . Le reste de la somme, vous le donnerez à ma vieille mère. (Il pleure amèrement.) J'ai encore ma mère, madame. (*F.*, III, 5)

La Reine: Fais tes conditions. Si tu as une vieille mère, et qu'il faille couvrir sa nappe de lingots d'or, parle, je le ferai. (*M. T.*, II, 3)

Mary does not make her bargain with the same motive as the marquise de Favras, but her change of mind places her in a similar

¹² *Favras*, III, 1; *Marie Tudor*, III, 1, 10.

¹³ *Favras*, III, 5.

¹⁴ *Marie Tudor*, II, 3-4.

position, and when she determines to rescue Fabiani she can employ, like the Marquise, a man who has agreed to die.

The funeral procession, the principal spectacle of each play, now crosses the stage on its way to the place of execution.¹⁵ After its passing, a man—and in each play this man has been an original instigator of the mob—suspects something, voices his suspicions, and disappears to investigate:

La Foule: Le voilà! Le voilà!

Turcati: Eh! non, ce n'est pas lui.

Morel: Je veux monter à l'Hôtel-de-Ville, pour savoir un peu ce qui se passe. Il a peut-être trouvé encore quelque faute d'orthographe . . . ou plutôt il y a quelque manigance. Je vas voir ça. (Il monte à l'Hôtel-de-Ville.) (*F.*, III, 12)

Simon Renard (après que le cortège a disparu): Qu'est-ce que cela signifie? Est-ce bien là Fabiani? Je le croyais moins grand. Est-ce que maître Énéas? . . . Il me semble que la reine l'a gardé auprès d'elle un instant. Voyons donc! (Il s'enfonce sous l'escalier, à la suite du cortège.) (*M. T.*, III, 2, 1)

In both plays the attention of the audience at the moment of the execution is fixed on the two women who await the result. The scene between them in *Favras* is brief and that in *Marie Tudor* is extended, yet the latter scene is largely a working out of the dramatic values inherent in the former. In *Favras* Théroigne has no idea that the substitution is to be attempted, whereas the Marquise is confident that it has now succeeded. Jane and the Queen are in exactly the same relationship to one another at the beginning of the last scene of *Marie Tudor*, but Hugo enlarges the scene until their mutual revelations and the interplay of their emotions have created doubt in the minds of both as to the outcome. In *Favras* the audience is in suspense, but each woman is sure; in *Marie Tudor* the women intensify the suspense of the audience by sharing its doubts. Despite artistic gains, Hugo has lost some of the ironic value of the situation, for the misplaced pity of Mme de Favras for Théroigne is keenly, if briefly, dramatic.

The result of the execution is announced to the audience by the reappearance, in *Favras* as in *Marie Tudor*, of the man who has prevented the substitution. He accompanies the man he has saved and takes credit, not for saving him, but for the death of the man condemned. Here are the final scenes of the two plays:

¹⁵ *Favras*, III, 11; *Marie Tudor*, III, 2, 1.

Théroigne (qui se détourne de l'exécution, se trouve en face de la marquise.) Comment c'est vous? vous ici?

Mme de Favras (lui donnant le portefeuille.) Tenez, prenez ceci . . . c'est Marcel qui vous le donne. . . . Et songez . . . que vous avez en moi . . . une amie qui toujours. . . .

Marcel (traversant la foule accompagné de Morel et d'un cavalier.) Ne prends pas! C'est le prix d'un marché qui n'a pas eu lieu.

Morel: Grâce à moi.

Mme de Favras: C'est vous! vous!!! Et là? là? qui donc. . . . (Elle aperçoit son mari.) Ah!!! (Elle tombe évanouie.) (*F.*, III, 15)

La Reine: Il n'y en a plus qu'un de vivant. Dans un instant nous saurons lequel. Mon Dieu, celui qui va entrer, faites que ce soit Fabiano!

Jane: Mon Dieu, faites que ce soit Gilbert! (Le rideau du fond s'ouvre, Simon Renard paraît, tenant Gilbert par la main.) Gilbert! (Ils se précipitent dans les bras l'un de l'autre.)

La Reine: Et Fabiano?

Simon Renard: Mort.

La Reine: Mort? Mort! Qui a osé?

Simon Renard: Moi. J'ai sauvé la reine et l'Angleterre. (*M. T.*, III, 2, 2)

What is convincing is no one resemblance between the plays, but the total number and the fact that while parts of the plot of *Favras* do not reappear in *Marie Tudor*, nearly all the important elements of the latter part of *Marie Tudor* have prototypes of some sort in *Favras*. It is no exaggeration to say that Dumas' *Christine* plus *Favras* will account for so much of the plot of *Marie Tudor* that Hugo's contribution is less one of invention than of fusion, rearrangement, transference into another setting and expression in a richer style. The French Revolution had to become Mary's England, but *Marie Tudor* is still full of the atmosphere of the Revolution. The Place de Grève and the Châtelet had to become Tyburn and the Tower of London, but as Joshua remarks to Fabiano: "*A Paris, Tyburn s'appelle la place de Grève.*"¹⁶ The condemned man was transformed from the marquis de *Favras* to *Fabiano Fabiani*, favori de la reine, a linguistic expansion as typical of Hugo as it would be surprising in another writer. Marcel, man of the people, became romanticized into *Gilbert le ciseleur*, but remained the devoted lover of a younger and less responsible woman. *Christine* and *Favras* were perhaps fused in the scene where Mary offers the executioner her lover's head;¹⁷ in *Christine* the Queen

¹⁶ From an *acte inédit*. Hugo, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

¹⁷ *Marie Tudor*, II, 9.

delivers her favorite to the executioner, but it is in *Favras* that the official executioner appears prominently on the stage and takes the Marquis away to his doom.¹⁸

Yet Hugo made one most important alteration of rôle. So far as the action is concerned, Mary corresponds to the marquise de Favras, but the character, emotions, and acting values of her part are utterly different. No doubt Hugo owes something to history in his conception of the Queen, perhaps also something to Dumas, and certainly something to his own imagination. More than any of these, his Mary is a royal incarnation of Théroigne de Méricourt, instable, emotional, alternating sentimentality with callousness, imperious, jealous. In *Favras* she is shown helpless at one moment, commanding at another, an object of alternate pity and fear to Mme de Favras. Mary has bothered even friendly critics of Hugo's plays; Vitu put his finger on the spot with remarkable exactness: "*Ce n'est pas une reine, c'est une harengère.*"¹⁹

The fact that Hugo had thought of Théroigne in writing the rôle of Mary, whereas Mme de Favras occupied the position he gave Mary with relation to the plot, probably accounts for his confusion in writing the conclusion to the play.²⁰ The first version gives the *tableau* which corresponds to that of *Favras*: Mary-Théroigne is victorious as the man she loves reappears, while Jane falls unconscious, like Mme de Favras, on realizing that the man she loves has died. But this is the reverse of the plot-outcome of *Favras*, where the attempted substitution fails, thwarted by Morel's suspicions. On reconsideration, Hugo preferred to follow the plot which had inspired so much of his play. Certainly he had no predilection for the happy ending, nor did his audience at the Porte-Saint-Martin, but he may have thought this outcome more logical, and in any event it enabled him to expand Morel's: "*Grâce à moi*" into the striking last line of *Marie Tudor*.

GIRDLER B. FITCH

The Citadel, Charleston

¹⁸ Act III, scene 11.

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, II, 213.

²⁰ Paul et Victor Glachant, *Essai critique sur le théâtre de Victor Hugo: Les Dramas en prose*, Paris, Hachette, 1903, pp. 129-30.

THE DATES OF DIDEROT'S BIRTH AND DEATH

Too many biographers of Diderot, even including M. André Billy in his recent and in general excellent work (1932), have adopted the unfortunate practice of not citing authorities. In cases of disagreement or any degree of uncertainty, it is therefore impossible, without further research, to be sure what are the facts. This is true even in the matter of the exact dates of Diderot's birth and death.

Although most biographers of Diderot agree that he was born "le 5 octobre 1713,"¹ Luppol carelessly says "le 1^{er} octobre."² Diderot's daughter, Mme de Vandeuil, puts his birth merely "au mois d'octobre."³ Jal, speaking with conviction because he has, as he says, "l'acte de baptême" before his eyes, declares for "le 6 octobre,"⁴ while Assézat,⁵ the editor of Diderot, presumably follows the supposedly authoritative Jal. Joseph Texte not unnaturally accepts the testimony of one or both of these immediate predecessors in favor also of the sixth.⁶

Curiously enough, Diderot himself, jocularly, and perhaps also with that rather customary indifference to accuracy in details which Grimm attributed to him,⁷ gives his birth date as "le deux octobre." Thus he writes to Grimm, October 2, 1776: "Songez qu'au deux d'octobre prochain, j'aurai soixante trois, quatre ou cinq ans; que sçais-je?"⁸

¹ Thus: Naigeon, *Mémoires . . . sur la vie et les ouvrages de Diderot*, Paris, Brière, 1821, p. 1; J. Reinach, *Diderot*, Paris, 1894, p. 11, n.; A. Collignon, *Diderot*, Paris, 1895, p. 4; A. Séché et Jules Bertaut, *Diderot*, Paris, n. d., p. 5; André Billy, *Diderot*, Paris, 1932, p. 11.

² I. K. Luppol, *Diderot*, Paris, 1936, p. 57.

³ Mme de Vandeuil, *Mémoires sur Diderot*, in Diderot, *Œuvres* (Assézat ed., Paris, 1875-77), I, p. xxix.

⁴ Auguste Jal, *Dictionnaire critique de biographie et d'histoire*, 2nd ed., Paris, 1872, p. 495. "L'acte du baptême," says Jal, "est sous mes yeux."

⁵ Assézat, *op. cit.*, I, p. lxiii.

⁶ Joseph Texte, Diderot, *Extraits*, Paris, Hachette, n. d., 14th ed., *Introduction*, p. xii.

⁷ Cf. Grimm, Letter of January 26, 1765, *Corr. litt.*, Paris, Garnier, 1877-82, xvi, 423.

⁸ Diderot, *Corr. inédite*, Babelon ed., Paris, 1931, I, 171.

Slight as these differences are, it is well to settle the matter once for all by exact citation of a photographic copy of the "acte de baptême" of Diderot, now preserved at the "Mairie de Langres."⁹

Le 6^e octobre 1713 aetté baptisé denis né d'hier fils en legitime mariage de didier diderot me. coutellier et d'angelique vigneron son pere et mere le parain denis diderot me. coutellier la maraine claire vigneron Les quels ont signé avec le pere present

denis diderott
Didier Diderot

Claire vigneron
Rigollot
Vic

Thus it is clear from this document, signed by the two "master cutlers," the father and the grandfather, by his mother's sister, Claire Vigneron, and by the Vicar Rigollot, that the infant Diderot, baptized on the 6th was "né d'hier." The date of his birth can therefore now be fixed definitely as October 5, 1713.

As to the date of Diderot's death, most biographers agree that it occurred "le 30 juillet 1784" and, as Mme de Vandeul says, "le samedi."¹⁰ Yet her husband, Diderot's son-in-law, writing early in August to his brother at Châteauroux, M. de Melville, informed him: "L'illustre Diderot n'est plus, mon ami; il est mort subitement, le samedi 31 juillet."¹¹ Likewise the contemporary Meister,¹² in the *Correspondance littéraire*, addresses his readers in similar terms: "M. Diderot n'est plus: c'est le 31 juillet qu'il est mort."¹³ The "acte de décès," quoted by Assézat from Jal's *Dictionnaire critique de biographie et d'histoire*,¹⁴ gives the date of burial as "le 1^{er} août" and speaks of Diderot as "décédé hier."¹⁵ This testimony

⁹ The registers of the Church of Saint-Pierre, where Diderot was baptized, are now at the "Mairie de Langres." (Information obtained through the courtesy of M. Pierre Josserand of the Bibliothèque Nationale.)

¹⁰ Assézat, I, pp. lvii-lviii.

¹¹ Cited by Le Chanoine Marcel in *La Mort de Diderot*, Paris, Champion, 1925, p. 45.

¹² Meister at this time had definitely succeeded Grimm as editor of the *Correspondance littéraire*. Cf. the *Corr. litt.*, II, 234-236; X, 208-209, n. Cf. also G. Lanson, *Manuel bibliographique*, p. 625.

¹³ *Corr. litt.*, XIV, 17 (août 1784).

¹⁴ Jal, *op. cit.*, p. 496. As Assézat indicates, the document has also been reproduced by Paul Boiteau in his edition of the *Mémoires de Mme d'Épinay*, Paris, Charpentier, 1863, II, 496-497.

¹⁵ Assézat, I, p. lxiv.

agrees with that of M. de Vandeul and of Meister.¹⁶ Verification of Jal's quotation, by comparison with the original document,¹⁷ is now impossible. The "acte de décès" of Diderot no longer exists, having been destroyed in the burning of the Hôtel de Ville during the Commune in May 1871.¹⁸ It should be noted, however, that "le samedi," given by both Mme de Vandeul and her husband as the day of Diderot's death, fell in 1784 on the 31st of July, not on the 30th.¹⁹ It is much more probable that Diderot's daughter was mistaken in her memories as to the date than as to the day of the week, particularly as the funeral, coming on Sunday, August 1, would serve to make the day before, Saturday, stand out in her mind. Thus, unexpectedly, the testimony of Mme de Vandeul seems really to confirm that of her husband, of Meister, and of the "acte de décès" as reported by Jal.

Canon Marcel, however, in his detailed and documented study, *La Mort de Diderot*, believes that Diderot died on Friday, July 30. There were indeed various contemporary rumors of doubtful value that the philosopher died in the country, in that case probably at his "pied-à-terre" at Sèvres,²⁰ that his body was transported secretly to the apartment which had been procured for him by Catherine II on the rue de Richelieu, and that M. de Vandeul, in order to secure for Diderot a church funeral and burial in consecrated ground, engaged in an intrigue to make the priest believe

¹⁶ Joseph Texte, though giving the 30th in one place, follows Assézat in regard to the 31st some pages later. Cf. Texte, *op. cit.*, pp. xii, xxxiii.

¹⁷ It is worth noting that no one of the three citations of the "acte de décès" as given by Paul Boiteau, by Jal, or by Assézat, agrees exactly with any other, though the divergences are minor in character.

¹⁸ Cf. Jal, *op. cit.*, "Préface de la seconde édition," pp. i-ii. M. Pierre Josserand of the Bibliothèque Nationale informs me: "C'est à l'Hôtel de Ville qu'avaient été transportés tous les registres paroissiaux de l'ancien régime. . . . De la paroisse Saint-Roch ne subsiste qu'un registre baptistaire partiel de 1790."

¹⁹ Note that the *Correspondance littéraire* mentions in another connection "le lundi 28 juin" 1784. (xiv, 3.) A simple calculation shows therefore that the 31st of July fell that year on Saturday. Mention of "le dimanche 11 juillet" (xiv, 10) and of "le jeudi 15" (xiv, 11) offers further confirmation of the previous statement. A mathematical check on the accuracy of these dates may be obtained by use of the formula given in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (11th ed., 1910-11), Art. *Calendar*, Vol. IV, p. 998.

²⁰ Le Chanoine Marcel, *op. cit.*, pp. 6, 44. Cf. p. 47.

that his father-in-law had died in Paris in the parish of Saint-Roch on the 31st instead of in the country on the 30th.²¹ In confirmation of this conclusion that Diderot's death was deliberately post-dated one day, Canon Marcel cites a letter by Mme Caroillon of Langres, mother of Diderot's son-in-law, M. de Vandeul. She states that she learned of the philosopher's death through a letter from another of her sons, M. des Tillières, and that this letter bore the date of July 30.²² The actual letter of M. des Tillières, however, has not been found, so it cannot be stated positively that it was in fact so dated.

Although Canon Marcel ordinarily places little reliance on the detailed accuracy of Mme de Vandeul's *Mémoires*—and often with good reason—he accepts as true the date she gives, the 30th, in spite of the fact that the day of the week, Friday instead of Saturday, does not tally with the rest of her statement. On the other hand, he rejects the testimony of M. de Vandeul, written immediately after the event, although in his case the date and the day of the week are both in agreement. If M. and Mme de Vandeul, and presumably M. des Tillières and other members of the family at Paris also, had been engaged in an intrigue to deceive the public and the priest about the date of Diderot's death, would they not have been careful to agree upon the same day and date? Moreover, if Diderot had died twenty-four hours before the priest was called, would it have been possible to mislead the latter, accustomed to attend the dead and the dying, and consequently entirely able to distinguish between a body to which death had come recently and one which had been cold for nearly twenty-four hours? Evidently the priest could hardly have been deceived, unless we conclude that he also was in connivance with the intrigue attributed to M. de Vandeul,—and that certainly is not a conclusion which Canon Marcel is inclined to accept.

Before we reject the testimony of M. de Vandeul, in which date and day of the week both agree, the testimony of the *curé* Marduel of Saint-Roch as represented by the "acte de décès," which he signed, the testimony of Meister and other contemporaries,²³ it

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 45.

²³ Cf. Le Chanoine Marcel, *op. cit.*, p. 45, n. 123, where the *Journal de Paris* for August 3, 1784 and the *Mercure de France* for August 14, 1784, are cited as also giving July 31 as the date of Diderot's death.

would seem that we must have more evidence than a single letter by Mme Caroillon, who was not on the spot and who was quoting another letter, probably written in haste, under stress of emotion, and in view of all the other evidence seemingly misdated. Indeed Mme Caroillon herself may have unintentionally been mistaken and given the date incorrectly.

Thus the death of Diderot, born on October 5, 1713, occurred in all probability on Saturday, July 31, 1784.

GEORGE R. HAVENS

Ohio State University

A SECOND VERSION OF JOHN DAY'S *PEREGRINATIO SCHOLASTICA*

In 1881 A. H. Bullen published the *Peregrinatio Scholastica*, or *Learneinges Pillgrimadge* in his edition of John Day's works. The text was based upon Sloane MS. 3150 in the British Museum. Another version exists; it once belonged to the Duke of Bridgewater and later to the Earl of Gower, and is now lodged in the Huntington Library.¹ It was known to Todd, who briefly described it in his note to Warton's "Remarks on Spenser's Allegorical Character."² It is a holograph, written in a fairly neat secretary hand that bears a marked resemblance to the other known MSS. by Day (Sloane 3150 and *The Parlament of Bees*, Lansdowne MS. 725).³

¹ I have not seen the original MS. My information is based upon a photostatic copy, for which I am greatly obliged to Mr. R. B. Haselden, Curator of MSS. in the Huntington Library.

² H. J. Todd (*The Works of Spenser*, 1805, II, cxxv f.) transcribed the title and some phrases from the table of contents. C. H. and T. Cooper (*Athenae Cantabrigienses*, II [1861], 476) apparently refer to the same MS. They supply information that could not have been found in Todd and declare that their version is among the Additional MSS. in the British Museum, where I was not able to locate it.

³ The Huntington MS. consists of twenty-nine leaves, of which the twenty-five leaves of text are numbered. The verso of the last leaf has thirteen lines of writing. The dedication occupies a page and four lines, a table of contents occupies two pages and six lines, and a blank page comes between the dedication and the text. John Day's name appears on

The Sloane MS. is dedicated to William Austin (1587-1634),⁴ the author of *Certayne Devout, Godly, and Learned Meditations* and *Hæc Homo*. The Huntington MS., on the other hand, is inscribed to "Mr: Thomas Dowtonn Gentlemann, & Brother of the Right Wo^{pp}^f Companie of the vintners." The dedication, which has not been printed before, follows:

Worthie Sr:

Learnenge is soe preste downe vnder the Iron hande of *Necessitie*; And the poore pro-fessours of it, soe *Baffled* and scornde in the eye of vulgar opinion As weare it not for some fewe generous sperrits, that protect and in spight of *Envie* cherishe it; This land w^{ch} not longe since, and worthelie was titled *Hortum Musarum*, will shortlie share title wth *Athens*, and be calld *stabulum Mularum*: vpon this occasionn I haue composde a *Morrall* poeme, and namde it the schollers pillgrimage In w^{ch} amongst some easie and slight passadges for recreation onlie; I dare promise yo^u shall meete wth matter, well worthie more serious meditacionn: w^{ch} with my vnfaigned loue, And Tender of my most faithfull service, I dedicate to yo^r freindlie and favourable acceptance, commendinge yo^u and yo^r more materiall proceedeings vnto the protectionn of the Allmightie:

Yours in what his poore Indeuours maie—

JOHN DAYE

Thomas Dowton, or as his name is spelt in current reference books Thomas Downton, was an Elizabethan and Jacobean actor who may have first entered the profession in 1593 as one of Lord Strange's men.⁵ His name appears in a list of Admiral's men that is dated December 14, 1594.⁶ He acted regularly with the Admiral's men from 1597 to 1603, with the Prince's company until 1612, and with Palsgrave's certainly until 1615 and probably until 1618.⁷ On February 15, 1617-8, he married a vintner's widow and became

the title-page, in the heading of the salutation, and at the end of the dedication.

⁴ The MS. *Parlament of Bees* is dedicated to the same man, although his name appears in the variant spelling "Augustine." See E. K. Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, III, 287.

⁵ Chambers, II, 124; W. W. Greg, *Henslowe Papers*, p. 41, and *Henslowe's Diary*, II, 263.

⁶ Greg, *Henslowe's Diary*, I, 5; II, 262, 263.

⁷ E. Nungezer, *A Dictionary of Actors*, pp. 117-119.

a vintner.⁸ He drew up his will on July 25, 1625,⁹ and the will was proved in the same year.¹⁰

The dedication of the Huntington MS. to Dowton the vintner indicates that the work must have been completed between 1618 or 1619, by which date he had certainly become a vintner (as the records of St. Giles, Cripplegate, show),¹¹ and 1625, when he died.

The question of priority now arises. That the Sloane MS. is the earlier is suggested by the dedication of the MS. *Parlament of Bees*, in which Day writes to William Augustine (Austin) as follows:

Noble Sr.

The first, & last bothome that ever I lancht vpon the strange, (& to me then vnknowne sea) calld *Mare Dedicatorium*, was bownd for *Cape Bona Speranza*, where yo^r wor^d was governo^r, And the most of my Ladeing (at that Tyme being an vnknoweing venturer,) were but *feriae Nugae* at the best, yet they returnd me more then a deservd gratuitie, w^{ch} emboldens me to a second adventure, fraught wth a more pleasing & vendible commoditie.¹²

This dedication undoubtedly refers to the Sloane MS. of the *Peregrinatio*, containing Day's earlier dedication to Austin, and suggests that it was his first and only dedicated work. If one accepts this statement, it follows that the Huntington MS. is later than both the Sloane MS. and the MS. *Parlament of Bees*. But since Dowton (to whom, it will be remembered, the Huntington MS. is dedicated) died nine years before Austin, one is thus forced to assume that Day revised the Sloane *Peregrinatio* and dedicated it to another patron while Austin was still alive. The very terms of the MS.

⁸ Chambers, II, 313.

⁹ G. E. Bentley, "Records of Players in the Parish of St. Giles, Cripplegate," *PMLA.*, XLIV (1929), 801. (One of the St. Giles's entries reads as follows: "1617 8 Oct. [Buried] John Daye svant to Tho. Doughten Player." This John Daye cannot possibly be the dramatist and tract-writer, who lived until 1640.)

¹⁰ *Index of Wills Proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, 1620-9* (The Index Library, London: The British Record Society, XLIV, 1912), VI, 90.

¹¹ Bentley, *loc. cit.*: "1619 11 June Buried Jane daughter of Tho. Downton Vintener."

¹² The text is based upon a photostatic copy of Lansdowne MS. 725 in the British Museum. Bullen in his transcript read "desird" for "deservd" and "emboldend" for "emboldens."

Parlament of Bees dedication argue against such an assumption: Day dedicated this work to Austin precisely because he had been well rewarded for the Sloane *Peregrinatio*; he would have had no reason to search for another patron. Hence the Huntington MS. must be the earlier. A similar argument can be used to date the Sloane MS. definitely after 1625. That Dowton accepted the Huntington MS. is strongly suggested by an acrostic poem on his name signed John Day,¹³ which reads like a note of thanks for Dowton's "compassionate harte."¹⁴ It is unlikely, therefore, that Day rewrote the *Peregrinatio* until after Dowton's death.

A further proof, perhaps trivial, that the Huntington MS. precedes the Sloane MS. is the correction of *Perigrinatio* to *Peregrinatio*.

Clearly, then, Day is guilty, in the MS. *Parlament of Bees*, of a falsification. It is possible, however, to suggest in extenuation that Day's earlier patron had died, that the work had not been published, and that Day was in need. Day does not, after all, indulge in gross flattery, and the worst that can be said of the dedication is that it implies in Day a higher degree of independence than he possessed.

Although the Sloane MS. retains the substance of the earlier version, it is, nevertheless, a thorough reworking of the material. Tractates 16 and 17 are entirely new. In a few instances material is transferred from one tractate to another; thus Tractate 15, which in the main follows Tractate 16 of the original, incorporates the description of Despair from Tractate 15. In addition to rearrangement, there is considerable reduction and enlargement. Even when the earlier version is closely followed, there are some verbal changes. As an example, take a passage from Tractate 3. Huntington MS. (p. 5^v):

. . . her Buskins weare Artefullie enlacde wth corral; and neatlie buttond wth diamonds: In w^{ch} the amorous contentions betwixt *Venus* and *Adonis* were storied out to the life, at w^{ch} she semde to spurne, and trample vnder

¹³ The poem, which is preserved at Dulwich, has been printed by J. F. Herbert, [Old] *Shakespeare Society Papers*, I (1844), 19; Bullen, *The Works of John Day*, Introduction, pp. 12, 13; Nungezer, *A Dictionary of Actors*, pp. 119, 120.

¹⁴ Greg (*Henslowe Papers*, pp. 126, 127, and *Henslowe's Diary*, II, 263), unaware of the Huntington MS. and of the connection between Day and Dowton, does not believe that the dramatist was the author of the acrostic poem.

ffoote in scorne, vpon her head she wore a kinde of rich but careles *Tyara*; vpon that a girland of carnations and Rose buds scarce blowne and new pluckt out of the civett bosome of the Springe, a trew *Hieroglyphick* of Chastetye.

Sloane MS.:¹⁵

. . . Her buskins were enchasht with corall and buttond with diamonds, in which were lively exprest the amorous contentions betwixt Venus and Adonis, which, in signe of hate to loue, she semd to spurne and scorne (as they say) with her heeles. Uppon her head stood a garland of rose buds and carnations halfe blowne (new pluckt out of the bosome of the springe) which, quickend with the heat of her breath, semd to spring and growe afreshe.

A general description of all the changes would be confusing, a detailed one extremely complicated. It will suffice for the present to note that the alterations enhance the vividness and realism of the story.

M. E. BORISH

College of William and Mary

A POSSIBLE SOURCE FOR THE FEMALE DISGUISE IN BYRON'S *DON JUAN*

One possible source has been already noted for Juan's disguise as a woman and his subsequent adventures in the sultan's harem in Byron's *Don Juan*, Cantos v and vi. Captain Rees Gronow suggested that a prank of Dan Mackinnon, a nineteenth century wag, inspired the incident.

Another of his [Mackinnon's] freaks very nearly brought him to a court-martial. Lord Wellington was curious about visiting a convent near Lisbon, and the lady abbess made no difficulty; Mackinnon, hearing this, contrived to get clandestinely within the sacred walls, and it was generally supposed that it was neither his first nor his second visit. At all events, when Lord Wellington arrived, Dan Mackinnon was to be seen among the nuns, dressed out in their sacred costume with his head and whiskers shaved; and as he possessed good features, he was declared to be one of the best-looking amongst those chaste dames. It was supposed that this adventure, which was known to Lord Byron, suggested a similar episode in *Don*

¹⁵ *Peregrinatio Scholastica*, ed. Bullen, p. 27.

Juan, the scene being laid in the East. I might say more about Dan's adventures in the convent, but have no wish to be scandalous.¹

Elsewhere Gronow referred to the acquaintanceship of Byron and Mackinnon at Lisbon during which the former "was much amused with Dan Mackinnon's funny stories."²

Gronow's theory is not well authenticated. His earliest memoirs appeared thirty-seven years after Byron's death and his accuracy when retailing second-hand experiences is questionable.³ In a political note Byron refers to the case of Mackinnon,⁴ but he never mentions the man or the prank in his published letters. Eleven years elapsed between Byron's short Lisbon visit and the writing of Canto v in 1820, time for the anecdote to be forgotten unless recalled by new information. Besides the use of female disguise (under very different circumstances) there is only one similarity in incident between Juan's adventures and Mackinnon's, as told afterwards by Gronow: the sultan and the ladies of the harem commend Juan's feminine good looks.⁵ The likeness in mood seems unimportant: Juan, like Mackinnon, misbehaves;⁶ but Juan misbehaves similarly throughout the poem.

An alternative theory arises from the knowledge that Byron, while writing the *Don Juan*, used a book where disguise as a woman is employed four times. In 1821 he wrote to his publisher, "By the way, much of the description of the furniture in Canto 3^d is taken from Tully's *Tripoli* (pray note this), and the rest from my own observation."⁷ As has been long known, Byron borrowed details of clothing⁸ as well as household furniture from this narrative.

¹ Gronow, *Reminiscences*, London, 1862, 85-86; *Recollections and Anecdotes of the Camp, the Court, and the Clubs*, London, 1870, 62; *Reminiscences and Recollections*, London, 1889, I, 62. Coleridge, *The Works of Lord Byron*, London, 1903, VI, 276, drew attention to Gronow's suggestion.

² Gronow, *Last Recollections*, London, 1866, 100; *Anecdotes of Celebrities*, London, 1870, 259; *Reminiscences and Recollections*, II, 259.

³ *DNB.*, VIII, 713.

⁴ *Works*, VI, 69.

⁵ *Don Juan*, v, clv; VI, xxxvi.

⁶ *Don Juan*, VI, lxx-lxxxv.

⁷ Prothero, *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron*, London, 1900, v, 346. [Tully, Miss] *Narrative of a Ten Years' Residence at Tripoli in Africa*, London, 1816. For authorship see Preface, iii.

⁸ Cf. *Don Juan*, III, lxi-lxxvii with the *Tripoli*, 30-32, 133-137.

The first two disguises recorded by Miss Tully do not spring from amorous motives. Sidi Useph, the son of the bashaw, at enmity with his family, comes robed as a woman to a feast of Turkish ladies in order to overhear their conversation. His presence is discovered and he flees in the ensuing confusion. Again he is in the habit of coming so disguised to his sister's apartment within the harem until on his third visit "an awkward plait in his baracan" gives him away.⁹ The other disguises are used in a love affair where the lady is more eager than the man. Selima plots to catch sight of her betrothed, Sidi Mahmoud, is piqued by his indifference, grows melancholy and then sick. The servant Ismaini decoys the lady to a small house in the garden where Sidi Mahmoud is found, robed as a country woman. After Sidi's departure for Naples and his rumored defections, Selima again falls ill. Once more on his return the young man dresses as a woman, seeks out the faithful Ismaini, and goes this time to his betrothed's apartments.¹⁰ Miss Tully has earlier commented on Turkish courtships, "Notwithstanding the severest restrictions of the Prophet Mahomet on this point and the seclusion of a female's life, yet by the help of emissaries (which for money are to be found in this country on all occasions), those betrothed sometimes obtain with difficulty and danger a distant view of each other and even learn each other's sentiments."¹¹

Miss Tully's letters therefore indicate that disguise as a woman was not infrequent among the Turks. She refers to the general use of emissaries and to specific examples of disguise and connivance by servants in the aid of a love-sick lady. Byron's Gulbeyaz, smitten by the charms of Juan in the slave market, tells her eunuch Baba to fetch him. It is Baba who prudently arranges the female disguise and conveys the indifferent lad to her.¹² Her amorous malady surpasses Selima's in intensity and according to Baba is still uncured at the end of the episode.¹³

No similarity of Juan's adventures with Mackinnon's or Sidi Mahmoud's is close enough to preclude the possibility of sheer in-

⁹ *Tripoli*, 147, 261.

¹⁰ *Tripoli*, 302-4, 305.

¹¹ *Tripoli*, 301-2.

¹² *Don Juan*, v, lxxiii-xcv, cxiv.

¹³ *Don Juan*, v, cviii-cxli; vi, iii-viii, cv-exi, cxv.

vention by Byron. But, since Byron admittedly used localized details from Tully in the Eastern episodes of the *Don Juan*, since he was fond of factual material as a basis for other cantos,¹⁴ since he often and variously reiterated the boast

Besides, my Muse by no means deals in fiction:
She gathers a repertory of facts, (Don Juan, XIV, xiii)

are the following conjectures too wild? After 1816 Byron learned from the Tully letters that female disguise was an actual Turkish practice, sometimes used to appease a loving lady. The first idea of putting Juan into a harem in the dress of a woman may have germinated from that knowledge. If Byron had heard of Mackinnon's escapade, he may have recalled it when he came across the staid Tully episodes and, consciously or unconsciously, have fused the two impressions in creating the adventures of Juan. Byron's statement when he acknowledged some indebtedness to Tully's *Tripoli* is important: "No man ever . . . made his materials more his own."¹⁵ But if Byron owed anyone anything for the Juan disguise, he would seem to have found the more timely and accurate suggestion in Miss Tully's letters.

MARGARET E. MCGING

Low-Haywood School, Stamford, Conn.

MOORE TO HOBHOUSE: AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER

The William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, an adjunct of the University of California at Los Angeles, contains the following unpublished letter from Tom Moore to John Cam Hobhouse:

Newstead Abbey

Jan^y. 29^h 1828.

My dear Hobhouse. Being here alone I cannot help—with the thoughts which the place inspires—writing to you. I returned here for the purpose of making some further inquiries of Rushton¹ and old Nanny Smith,²

¹⁴ Canto II, Dalzell, *Shipwrecks and Disasters at Sea*; Cantos VII and VIII, Castelnau, *Essai sur l'Histoire Ancienne et Moderne de la Nouvelle Russie*.

¹⁵ *Letters*, v, 347.

¹ Robert Rushton, the son of one of Byron's tenants.

² An old servant at Newstead Abbey.

whom I dare say you remember, as she does you. How often I wish you were with me, or that I could bring some voice out of these walls to tell me all that happened in those joyous days when they were inhabited, I will say, by as brilliant a knot of young fellows as ever began the career of life together. I have been passing some days with Hodgson³ at Mr. Robt. Arkwright's,⁴ and found far more fun, as well as feeling, under that parsonic japan of his than I gave him the least credit for. He not only told me many pleasant things, but gave me some letters & extracts of letters, which place poor Byron in all that amiable light, which it is my great wish & object to surround him with. I have indeed, been lucky beyond my most sanguine expectations in this neighbourhood, having found a family at Southwell⁵ among whom he passed a considerable part of his early days, and who have given me letters & unpublished poems of his, written at a period which is now the most interesting of his life, as being the least known. I have got, too, a curious draft of the Will he made in 1811, with his instructions in the margin, and it is of course no new information to you that, in that Will, he left all his personal property to be divided between you, Hodgson, S. Davies⁶ &, I believe, the Revd. Mr. Beecher [sic].⁷ I am to dine with the Musters's⁸ next Sunday, and expect to get from her two or three little unpublished things which they tell me she possesses.

By the bye, ought not you or I to give this beast Hunt a dressing in the Ed. Review? It is the only way—beyond a contemptuous sentence or two—in which one can condescend to notice him, and I really thing [sic] a good sousing of ridicule, "without mitigation or remorse" is a thing that either you or I ought to inflict upon him.

You mentioned, in one of your late letters, B's translation of the Francesca,⁹ and said that you took for granted I had it. I have not, nor have ever seen it, and I should have told you this before, but that, in the humour I was then in, I was afraid it would look like asking *you* [sic] for it. This humour, however, is now gone by, and I not only mention it, but will most cheerfully ask for the manuscript, if there is any chance of your being able to give it to me.

I have been interrupted in my letter by a conversation with Nanny Smith, in which she frequently referred me to "Hobhouse" and

³ Francis Hodgson (1781-1852), provost of Eton, translator of Juvenal, minor poet; one of Byron's early friends.

⁴ A singer and composer of some talent.

⁵ The Pigots. Elizabeth Pigot was Byron's staunchest admirer.

⁶ Scrope Davies, one of the "Trinity Musketeers."

⁷ Rev. John Thomas Becher (1770-1848), prominent writer on social economy. On Becher's advice Byron suppressed his first book.

⁸ Mrs. John Musters was Mary Chaworth, who rejected Byron.

⁹ The 46-line fragment, "Francesca of Rimini," published in *The Letters and Journals of Lord Byron*, London, 1830, II, 309-311.

"Claridge,"¹⁰ his Lordship's "Fadge," for whatever she herself was unable to tell me. She has also been playing the "anus fatidica" about Lady B.

I have time for no more—Ever

Yours

T. MOORE.

If you cannot give me the Francesca, it is no matter—only do not *write* me about it, and receive me kindly when we meet, which I hope will be in about ten days.

Nottingham
3^d flat

I have just received a letter here from Murray, which has been delayed by my absence— It is about Byron, & I have but a minute to answer it.

Moore's thoroughness in harrying out everyone, even servants, who might contribute an anecdote or a letter is highly commendable. Also, in defense of his often attacked editorial practices, one finds a useful weapon in the phrase "extracts of letters." Obviously, he was at the mercy of Byron's well-wishing but editorially conscienceless friends. He could print no more than he was given, and the exigencies of weaving loose threads into a coherent pattern occasionally necessitated some violence to the texts. More revealing, however, is the biographer's admission that he proposes to place Byron in an "amiable light." Quite understandably, he wished to place in proper focus the distortions of Dallas, Medwin, and Hunt; but he became over-zealous and erred on the side of sympathy. It remained for a lesser man, John Galt, to capture Byron's elusive personality and to explain its contradictions.¹¹

Moore's bitterness against Hunt is not unexpected, though certainly unprovoked. Moore had jealously anticipated Hunt's *Lord Byron and Some of his Contemporaries* by publishing in *The Times* a vitriolic fable called "The 'Living Dog' and the 'Dead Lion.'" To this attack Hunt, or one of his friends, had replied in kind.¹² The somewhat querulous tone which Moore adopts toward Hob-

¹⁰ John Claridge, afterwards Sir John, one of Byron's juniors and favorites at Harrow.

¹¹ Galt felt that in treating Byron, Moore represented "only the sunny side: the limning is correct; but the likeness is too radiant and conciliatory." (*Life of Byron*, London, 1830, p. iv.)

¹² See *The Letters and Journals of Lord Byron*, ed. R. E. Prothero, London, 1898, II, 461-462. Moore's poem may be found in his collected works.

house in speaking of the "Francesda" reminds us that though the two men put up a show of friendship, neither quite trusted the other.

BRADFORD A. BOOTH

*The University of California
at Los Angeles*

A MANUSCRIPT ADDITION TO HAZLITT'S ESSAY
"ON THE FEAR OF DEATH"

W. Carew Hazlitt, grandson of the essayist, states that the following passage occurred "in the autograph MS. of an 'Essay on the Fear of Death,' written in 1821, but it was omitted in the printed version in 'Table Talk.'":

I want an eye to cheer me, a hand to guide me, a breast to lean on; all which I shall never have, but shall stagger into my grave without them, old before my time, unloved and unlovely, unless—. I would have some creature love me before I die. Oh! for the parting hand to ease the fall!¹

That this deleted passage refers to Sarah Walker, heroine of Hazlitt's *Liber Amoris*, is proven by a parallel paragraph in that volume under the caption "Written in a blank leaf of Endymion":

I want a hand to guide me, an eye to cheer me, a bosom to repose on; all which I shall never have, but shall stagger into my grave, old before my time, unloved and unlovely, unless S. L. keeps her faith with me.²

¹ W. Carew Hazlitt, *Memoirs of William Hazlitt* (London, 1867), II, 11. The MS. of this essay has been lost or destroyed, and the above deletion is not mentioned in the notes to the *Complete Works of William Hazlitt*, ed. P. P. Howe (London, 1930-4), VIII, 373-4.

Before Hazlitt published "On the Conduct of Life" (written at Renton Inn, Berwickshire, February, 1822) in Paris *Table-Talk* (1825), he cut out a long passage from his MS. His son, however, reinstated the passage when he reprinted the essay in *Literary Remains of the Late William Hazlitt* (London, 1836). This MS. addition contains the following sentence: "But should you let your blood stagnate in some deep metaphysical question, or refine too much in your ideas of the sex, forgetting yourself in a dream of exalted perfection, you will want an eye to cheer you, a hand to guide you, a bosom to lean on, and will stagger into your grave, old before your time, unloved and unlovely." (See *Complete Works*, XVII, 394-7).

² *Liber Amoris*, Works, IX, 114. Hazlitt frequently addresses Sarah Walker as S. L. in this book; see, e. g., "To S. L.," IX, 132. Perhaps this passionate outbreak actually found expression in Hazlitt's copy of Keats's

When composing "On the Fear of Death" Hazlitt doubtless wrote the foregoing expunged passage just after the following one, which appears in the essay:

My public and private hopes have been left a ruin, or remain only to mock me. I would wish them to be re-edified. I should like to see some prospect of good to mankind, such as my life began with. I should like to leave some sterling work behind me. I should like to have some friendly hand to consign me to the grave.³

In the third edition of *Table-Talk*, edited by Hazlitt's son, "On the Fear of Death" was printed with a concluding paragraph not used by its author in either of the editions of this volume issued during his lifetime; as Howe observes, no explanation was given by the son for its inclusion.⁴ However, in a letter to Hazlitt from Colburn, publisher of the second volume of *Table-Talk*, in which the selection originally appeared, there occurs a reference to an ending to the essay:

Dear Sir,

I send herewith all the 2nd vol., except the end of the 16th essay on the 'Fear of Death.' We want one essay yet to make out the volume of a tolerable size—which one it is desirable to bring in before the present 16th. Let me beg you will send me presently one of the essays . . . , otherwise I shall not be able to publish by the 1st June, which is very important.

Yours truly,

H. Colburn⁵

There is no certainty that the conclusion published by the son

poem, for W. Carew Hazlitt says "and with these [Milman's *Fazio* and Holcroft's *Road to Ruin*], and two or three other exceptions, the few books which belonged to him have completely disappeared. Where is his copy of Keats's 'Endymion?' Where is the 'Liber Amoris' in crimson velvet, which he took with him to Italy? Where is his 'Essay on Human Action,' enriched, as he left it, with his own notes in his own hand?" (*Memoirs*, II, 272).

³ "On the Fear of Death," *Works*, VIII, 325-6. It is quite possible, however, that the last sentence was added later to replace the deleted passage, the first sentence of which mentions both "hand" and "grave."

⁴ The paragraph is quoted *Works*, VIII, 374.

⁵ Quoted by W. C. Hazlitt, *Memoirs*, II, 5, but not referred to by Howe. Mr. Hazlitt dates this letter 1821, but it is obvious that it refers to 1822, for "On the Fear of Death" is listed as among those essays completed at Renton in a letter to Patmore, March, 1822 (see *Memoirs*, II, 68).

is the one mentioned by Colburn; nor, if it is, do we know whether or not Hazlitt intended to end his selection with it or whether or not he deleted it in the manuscript to which the son presumably had access. Since its author was securing his divorce during the first half of 1822 and traveled about considerably during this trying period, perhaps he did not receive the ending in proof from Colburn in time to incorporate it in the published essay. In lieu of the publisher's letter, therefore, the possibility is strong that the ending, unlike the foregoing reference to Sarah Walker, was not deleted but omitted by force of circumstances.⁶

STEWART C. WILCOX

University of Hawaii

BURKE'S ERROR REGARDING SUGAR-CRYSTALS

Edmund Burke's essay *The Sublime and Beautiful* (1757), launched in the midst of an age which had been setting up standards of good taste, gains perhaps its greatest novelty from the pure sensationalism of its aesthetic—of rendering beauty not in terms of rules but of qualities like clarity, smoothness, and sweetness, and discovering the sublime in antithetical qualities. Such an experimental attitude leads Burke readily into displaying an amateur's acquaintance with optics, the anatomy of the eye, the physiology of pain and pleasure, natural selection, and other scientific topics. In general, his information is fairly accurate if measured by the science of his day, but when in iv. xxi Burke comes to analyze the physiology of taste he makes a blunder that is strikingly naïve. He observes that "every species of salt examined by the microscope, has its own distinct, regular, invariable form. That of nitre is a pointed oblong; that of sea salt an exact cube; that of sugar a perfect globe." This notion that sugar-crystals are globular leads him to assume that the pleasing taste of sugar upon the tongue comes from the same tactile sensation as that produced by a handful of marbles, for there "is nothing near so pleasant to the touch as several globes, where the hand gently rises to one and falls to another; and this pleasure is greatly increased if the globes are in

⁶ Against this hypothesis is the fact that during the latter part of May, 1822, the essayist spent a hurried week in London (where he had not been since January) to see the second volume of *Table-Talk* through the press.

motion, and sliding over one another." He supposes furthermore that "in sweet liquors, the parts of the fluid vehicle though most probably round, are yet so minute as to conceal the figure of their component parts from the nicest inquisition of the microscope," and thus he ingeniously applies to "sweetness, the beautiful of the taste" the same principle by which he had found beauty in smooth tones, colors, and contours.

Where Burke picked up this misinformation about sugar-crystals is at first glance puzzling. Nowhere in 17th or 18th century books on crystallography and microscopy have I been able to find the mistake duplicated; Professor Marjorie Nicolson, whose monographs have cast much light upon similar subjects,¹ kindly tells me that she has found no such error in the mass of contemporary literature which she has read. If Burke had turned to the most popular book on microscopy in his time, Henry Baker's *The Microscope Made Easy* (3rd ed., London, 1744), p. 258, he would have found support for his theory that the shape of "saline Particles" has something to do with the pleasure or pain of their taste, but the plate of illustrations accompanying this discussion correctly shows in Fig. III that "the Salts of Sugar candy'd" are polyhedrons.²

The source of Burke's error, I venture to suggest, will be found not in books on experimental science but in Lucretius's *De rerum natura*—from which Burke elsewhere quotes two passages to illustrate sublimity.³ Burke's contention in iv. xx that smoothness, in all its aspects, is closely linked with "relaxation" of the senses and ultimately with the perception of beauty, while "bodies which

¹ Notably in "The Microscope and English Imagination," *Smith College Studies in Modern Languages*, vol. XVI.

² On pp. 263-64 Baker confirms Burke's statements regarding the shape of nitre and of sea-salt crystals. Nehemiah Grew, "A Discourse of the Diversities and causes of Tastes," in his *Anatomy of Plants* (London, 1682), p. 286, attributes differences in tastes to "the Principles" of various substances: "Those of all *Fluid Bodies*, *qua Fluid*, and therefore of *Water*, *Oyl*, and *Spirit*, I conceive to be *Globular*, but *hollow*, and with holes in their Sides. . . . These Principles affect the *Organs of Sense*, according to the variety of their Figures, and of their *Mixture*. So those which are sharp or poynted: and those which are *springy*; are fitted to produce any stronger *Taste*: and those which are round, are apt, of their own Nature, to produce a *weaker* or *softer* one." But no mention is made of sweetness or sugar in this connection.

³ In II. v and v. v.

are rough and angular, rouse and vellicate the organs of feeling, causing a . . . violent tension," invites comparison with Lucretius, II. 422 ff.:

omnis enim, sensus quae mulcet cumque, <figura>
haut sine principali aliquo levore creatast;
at contra quaecumque molesta atque aspera constat,
non aliquo sine materiae squalore repertast.

Burke explains more fully why water is smooth and relaxing, IV. xxi:

For as fluidity depends, according to the most general opinion, on the roundness, smoothness, and weak cohesion of the component parts of any body; and as water acts merely as a simple fluid; it follows that the cause of its fluidity is likewise the cause of its relaxing quality: namely, the smoothness and slippery texture of its parts.

This is very much like Lucretius's theory about the nature of liquids, which follows his famous molecular and atomic hypothesis:

illa quidem debent e levibus atque rotundis
esse magis, fluvido quae corpore liquida constant . . .
nec retinentur enim inter se glomeramina quaeque.⁴

Of water Lucretius says specifically, in the next Book:

namque movetur aqua et tantillo momine flutat
quippe volubilibus parvisque creata figuris.⁵

And the poet goes on to speak of honey, with its greater viscosity. One recalls Burke's speculation, previously cited, that "in sweet liquors, the parts of the fluid vehicle [are] most probably round," which follows his assumption about the shape of sugar-crystals. In making this mistake Burke probably had in mind these remarks of Lucretius on the globular structure of liquids; it is a likely guess, at least, that Lucretius's molecule becomes Burke's 'globular body.' The poet's association of this structure with sweetness of taste, while harsh substances "vellicate the organs of feeling," becomes evident in the following passage:

huc accedit uti mellis lactisque liquores
iucundo sensu linguae tractentur in ore;
at contra taetra absinthi natura ferique
centauri foedo pertorquent ora sapore;

⁴ II. 451 ff.

⁵ III. 189-190.

ut facile agnoscas e levibus atque rotundis
 esse ea quae sensus iucunde tangere possunt.
 at contra quae amara atque aspera cumque videntur,
 haec magis amatis inter se nexa teneri
 proptereaque solere vias rescindere nostris
 sensibus introituque suo perrumpere corpus.*

Burke's notion of a globular sugar-crystal—probably as alien to 18th century books on science as it is to nature—came to him, I think, through a simple association of ideas to which the ancient poet gives a clue. Several other sensory observations in Burke's essay seem to echo Lucretius.⁷ Indeed throughout his great poem Lucretius, being 'Epicurus owne sonne,' naturally creates an aesthetic of pure feeling—and this, as we see in *The Sublime and Beautiful*, is also Burke's striking characteristic.

DIXON WECTER

Henry E. Huntington Library

A BORROWER FROM QUARLES AND HERBERT

To the three spurious editions of Francis Quarles's *Enchiridion* called to our attention ten years ago by Mr. W. L. Ustick¹ may

* II. 398 ff. In IV. 615 ff. Lucretius repeats that smooth particles produce on the palate a pleasant taste, and rough ones an unpleasant sensation. He applies the same principles to other senses; e.g., in II. 408 ff. he says that the squeaking of a saw generates rough 'particles' (*elementa*) of sound while music creates smooth ones. Similarly Burke, III. xxv, contrasts "notes which are shrill, or harsh, or deep," with beautiful ones which are "clear, even, smooth, and weak."

⁷ Thus Burke's discussion of perspective in architecture, especially in reference to the optical effect of colonnades, in II. x, is almost a paraphrase of Lucretius on the same subject, IV. 426-431. The poet's catalogue of the awe-inspiring aspects of nature and how they inspire the terror and reverence of man, in V. 1204 ff. ("nam cum suspicimus magni caelestia mundi," etc.), may have afforded Burke some hints in his treatment of the same phenomena as sources of the sublime in II. ii, II. xiii, and II. xvii. Finally one may conjecture that Lucretius's long and eloquent passage in Book III on the intimate correlation between body and mind, sensation and mental state ("verum ubi vementi magis est commota metu mens," 152 ff.), may have had its effect upon Burke's psycho-physical viewpoint, notably in IV. iii when he discusses fear and terror.

¹ "Later editions of Quarles's *Enchiridion*," *Library*, Ser. 4, IX (1928), 184-6.

now be added a fourth: *Miscellanea; or, a mixture of choyce observations and institutions, moral and divine, composed for private use. Being the product of spare hours, and the meditations of J. H. . . . London, printed for Thomas Helder, at the Sign of the Angel in Little-Brittain. 1669*; ² for sixty-four of its ninety-two chapters are wholly or partially from Quarles's little book of piety and practical advice. In many instances entire chapters are reprinted, sometimes without any change and sometimes with only an unimportant word or two changed. Occasionally the compiler took a section from the *Enchiridion* and expanded it with a few sentences of his own.³ In other cases one chapter of the *Miscellanea* is a blend of several chapters of the *Enchiridion*.⁴

Thomas Helder, the publisher of the *Miscellanea*, did not enter it in the *Stationers' Register*; perhaps he felt that his recently acquired rights to the *Enchiridion* would serve for the *Miscellanea* also, the two works being so nearly the same. Assignment of the *Enchiridion* to him was entered in the *Stationers' Register* on June 21, 1668, or about a year before the publication of the *Miscellanea*. After obtaining the rights to the *Enchiridion*, Helder issued a number of editions of it. It is advertised, along with *Paradise Lost* and several other works, on recto A₆ of the *Miscellanea*.

Besides drawing on Quarles for about two thirds of his book, the compiler made unacknowledged use of a large part of George Herbert's poem, "Providence" (p. 116-26). The poem, with the title omitted, appears in the middle of a chapter of prose. The borrower apparently made no great effort to conceal his theft, for the first stanza is the same as in the original.⁵ But for his second stanza he used the ninth of Herbert's poem and thereafter omitted a number of those in the original.

It is clear that the compiler (or possibly the publisher or someone else into whose hands the selections fell) intended his work to be regarded as original. In his dedication to Arthur Annesley, the

² According to the *Term catalogues*, I, 488, and II, 232, Helder issued a "second edition" of this work in 1682 and another in 1688.

³ For example, compare *Miscellanea*, chap. 65, with *Enchiridion*, cent. II, chap. 51.

⁴ Thus, for example, chap. 17 of the *Miscellanea* is a blend of *Enchiridion*, cent. II, chap. 87, 97; cent. III, chap. 18, 28, 37; and cent. IV, chap. 74.

⁵ In this comparison I am using *The English works of George Herbert*, ed. by George Herbert Palmer (Boston and New York, 1907), III, 79-95.

first earl of Anglesey, he declares "this Mite of my first endeavours owes its being to your Lordships favour," and implores his "Lordships Correction of these imperfect lines." In his foreword to the reader he explains "The influence of the times, giving more than wonted spare hours, I did Compose this small Treatise for private use: But hoping this way to serve thee, when other opportunities may be denied, I have published it."

This "J. H." I have been unable to identify. Kennedy, Smith and Johnson attribute the book to Joseph Henshaw, bishop of Peterborough from 1663 to 1679, but cite no evidence.⁶ Henshaw was the author of two books of meditations, *Horae succisivae, or spare houres of meditations upon our dutie to God, others, ourselves* (1631), and *Meditations miscellaneous, holy, humane* (1637). It is possible that the *Miscellanea* was compiled by Helder himself, or by someone hired by Helder, in an effort to satisfy a demand for a popular type of literature, and to make buyers think they were getting something new. Some doubt, however, is cast upon this conjecture by the pious and intimate dedication to the Earl of Anglesey. At the same time, it seems unlikely that Joseph Henshaw, if he had compiled the book and wanted people to think that it was his own work, would have taken it to Thomas Helder for publication; for Thomas Helder, the publisher of the *Enchiridion* and the holder of the rights to it, could hardly have failed to recognize the source of the *Miscellanea*. Whoever was responsible for the *Miscellanea*, his wholesale stealing from such well-known writers as Quarles and Herbert suggests either considerable daring on his part, or an attitude in the seventeenth century toward plagiarism even more different from our own than is commonly supposed.

HAROLD REESE

Northwestern University

⁶ *Dictionary of anonymous and pseudonymous English literature*, New Ed., iv (1928), 86. The only evidence that I have found for attributing the book to Henshaw is an anonymous MS note in the copy of the *Miscellanea* in the British Museum. But in an anonymous MS note in the copy in the Newberry Library the book is attributed to a "J. Hall." The dates of these notes I have been unable to determine.

DONNE'S PARADOXES IN 1707

The extent to which Donne's writings were known during the later seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries is of interest to any serious student of his work. It may therefore be pertinent to list an instance of borrowing from him which has not (so far as I can discover) before been noted. John Dunton, founder of the "Athenian Society," published in 1707 a volume entitled *Athenian Sport: or, Two Thousand Paradoxes Merrily Argued To Amuse and Divert the Age*. Evidently by the time he reached page 92 of his book, Dunton's invention flagged; for in "Paradox xx: That Inconstancy is a most commendable Virtue," after giving a few of his own lucubrations he suddenly began to transcribe verbatim and bodily Donne's paradox, "A Defence of Women's Inconstancy." He did so without embarrassment, since he made no acknowledgment whatever of his source or of his own lack of originality. Having discovered an easy way to add to "his" paradoxes, Dunton continued to steal from Donne; on pp. 170, 307-8, 308-9, 314-15, 389-91, 395-6, 398-9, 399, 401, and 402-3. All of Donne's Paradoxes appear, with the significant exception of No. XII, "That Virginitie is a Virtue."¹ Dunton makes occasional small changes in wording, but none worth special note.

One sure conclusion from the foregoing evidence has some importance: that Donne's *Paradoxes* could not have been at all commonly known to Englishmen in 1707, or Dunton would hardly have dared risk the charge of plagiarism by printing them as his own.

GEORGE REUBEN POTTER

The University of California

¹ "That Virginitie is a Virtue" was not included in the editions of 1633, but was in those of 1652. Dunton presumably used a copy dating from one or the other of those years, since no other printing is known before 1923; and his failure to use the paradox on virginitie makes it probable that he saw an edition of 1633, since there seems no particular reason why, if he had known that last paradox, he would have refrained from stealing it as he did all the others.

RECENT WORKS ON PROSE FICTION BEFORE 1800

Ben Edwin Perry's "Early Greek Capacity for Viewing Things Separately" (*Trans. Am. Phil. Asso.*, lxviii, 403) warns students and interpreters of folk-tales and ancient fictions to beware of reading into them an intention to express broad generalizations about life. The primitive mind, he maintains, did not feel obliged, as we do today, to find meaning or coherence beneath the surface of events; "it occupied itself with the object immediately before it rather than with anything more remote." On this theory, it is anachronistic to look in early fictions for much in the way of unity of action, consistency in characterization, or harmony of design.—J. W. Knedler, Jr.'s "The Girl Without Hands" (*Abstr. Harv. Diss.*, 1938) was undertaken to test the practical value of the Julius Krohn geographical-historical methods which the Folklore Fellows have approved. The results were on the whole favorable, although some weaknesses were found, especially the difficulty of determining by the Krohn methods which one of several versions of a tale is probably the earliest.

The study of Chinese fiction is made easier by means of three new works,—*Chinese Fairy Tales and Folk Tales*, collected and translated [into German] by Wolfram Eberhard (Kegan Paul); *Chinese Prose Literature of the T'ang Period* (A. D. 618-906) by E. D. Edwards, Reader in Chinese at the University of London (Probsthain), the second volume of which illustrates the fiction of that time; and *The Golden Lotus* (Routledge), a translation by Clement Egerton of *Chin, P'ing, Mei*. This novel was written in the fifteenth or sixteenth century, but the action takes place in the twelfth, during the Tartar invasion. It might be termed a Chinese *War and Peace*, for it covers all important aspects of domestic and national life. It is written in so frankly realistic a style that some of the passages have, for the sake of decorum, been rendered in Latin. The titular character, passionate, unprincipled, and voluble, reminds one of Petronius' Fortunata. A reading of *The Golden Lotus*, which is as Chinese as Hu-Kwa tea and as universal as water, should give pause to those historians who over-emphasize distinctions between national literatures or literary periods.

Several types of fiction prevalent during the earliest Christian times are studied in E. Basil Redlich's *Form Criticism* (Duckworth) and B. T. D. Smith's *Parables of the Synoptic Gospels* (Cambr. U.). These works supplement, and at times correct, Dibelius' *From Tradition to Gospel* (cf. *MLN.*, li, 244). They

show, with respect to the apothegm-stories and parables of Jesus, what was particularly characteristic in his choice of subjects, and what was original in his way of unfolding the action and characterizing the persons. These are points of importance since no other fictions in world-literature have exercised a greater influence.

Philip H. Goepp's "Narrative Material of Apollonius of Tyre" (*ELH.*, v, 150) finds that this story, which is the only extant example of prose fiction in Old English, is closely related to the Constance cycle and also to the main plot of Greene's *Pandosto*. Against Rohde, and in agreement with Klebs, Goepp believes that the original version was not Greek but Latin, the work of a third-century sophist. The remarkably consistent style and purpose of the *Historia* he judges to be faithfully retained by the English translator.

About two hundred and fifty medieval narratives, mostly fictitious, are made conveniently available, in rather free translations, in John R. Reinhard's *Medieval Pageant*.—M. Gaster (*TLS.*, Sept. 4, 1937) traces the legend of Virgil and the Bread to its sources; and Robert Eisler (*TLS.*, Apr. 18, 1938) finds the anecdote about Newton and the seashore pebbles in St. Augustine.—John J. Parry's "Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Paternity of Arthur" (*Spec.*, xiii, 271) shows the medieval Defoe sedulous in making fictions look like true history, and pressing popularly accepted traditions into the service of rendering those fictions plausible.—The historical facts which form the core of the largely fictitious Letters of *Héloïse and Abélard* are well set forth in Enid McLeod's *Héloïse* (Chatto & Windus).—The most important parts of John of Salisbury's *Policraticus* are translated in Joseph B. Pike's edition, *Frivolities of Courtiers and Footprints of Philosophers* (U. of Minn.).

It is regrettable that Charles E. Kany's *Epistolary Novel in France, England, and Spain* (U. of California), a dissertation originally composed in 1920, was not published sooner. If it had been, Godfrey Singer's *Epistolary Novel* (cf. *MLN.*, xlv, 530) would probably have been an even better study than it is. Singer dealt with the letters in fictions of antiquity, but thence jumped into the sixteenth century with too slight consideration of what developments occurred during the Middle Ages and the early Renaissance. Kany's chief service is to fill that gap. He notes the use of letters in the fourteenth century by Machaut, Froissart, and Christine de Pisan; and in the fifteenth, by Aeneas Silvius, Diego de San Pedro, and Juan de Flores. From the sixteenth century onwards, and particularly after *l'Astrée* (1607-27), he finds their use rapidly increasing, and the ground thoroughly prepared for

the kinds of fictional letters,—satirical, frivolous, sentimental, and psychological,—which were to flourish after 1700. A study harmonizing the results of Kany and Singer is a *desideratum*.

Boccaccio is commonly regarded as a man's author; but paradoxically we now have from a woman, Catherine Carswell, the wisest and delightfulest biography yet written upon him, *The Tranquil Heart* (Lawrence and Wishart).—Friedrich Brie's "Französischer Frühhumanismus in England" (*Anglia*, xlix, 152) studies new methods and standards in histories and pseudo-histories, such as *Faits des Romains*, well known on both sides of the Channel.—On jest-books, there is "English Humour 1500-1800" (*TLS.*, May 21, 1938), reviewing the Bodleian Library exhibition of facetiae.

SIXTEENTH CENTURY.—We have several new and admirable editions. *Valentine and Orson* is excellently done for the EETS. by Arthur Dickson, whose fine monograph of 1929 on the French original and its sources should be used in connection with this text. For the first time since the days of Wynkyn de Worde, the complete version (including the entire second edition and the fragment of the first) is now generally accessible; and everything desirable in the way of variants, glossary, and footnotes has been thoroughly supplied.—Scholarly too is Philip E. Hallett's edition (Burns & Oates) of Ralph Robinson's translation of More's *Utopia*, "the first Catholic edition in modern times," with a judicious foreword by Lord Russell of Killowen.—The Oxford University Press, in cooperation with MLA., presents *A Petite Pallace of Pettie His Pleasure*, based on the Britwell copy, with variants from six other versions, and edited by Herbert W. Hartman, Jr. This should supplant the not quite satisfactory Gollancz edition.—For wealthy bibliophiles there is a magnificent *Daphnis and Chloe* in George Thornley's beautiful translation, with woodcuts by a distinguished French sculptor (Zwemmer).—A new rendering of Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, more accurate than that of 1764, is furnished by Warren E. Blake (U. of Mich. Press).—Anthony Blunt shows the influence upon literature and the arts, of *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* (*Journ. Warburg Inst.*, i).—Harry Ross's *Utopias Old and New* (Nicholson & Watson) gives outlines of many such accounts from Plato to modern times, including those of More, Campanella, and Harrington, accompanying the summaries with incisive and dogmatic comments on the social and political ideas the various authors held.

There is little or nothing of value to literary scholarship in Alfred H. Bill's *Astrophel, or the Life and Death of the Renowned*

Sir Philip Sidney (Cassell).—Kenneth T. Rowe (*PMLA.*, liv, 122) ably defends the Countess of Pembroke against charges of tampering with the *Arcadia* and Bowdlerizing it; he thinks her an honest editor, though careless, and believes she was in possession of a manuscript which had been revised by her brother.—Beatrice D. Brown's "Marlowe, Faustus, and Simon Magus" and Arpad Steiner's "Faust Legend and the Christian Tradition" (*PMLA.*, liv, 82, 391) explore the rich medieval antecedents of that legend, Steiner insisting that the hostile attitude towards intemperate searching after truth is not specifically Lutheran, as has been maintained, but had been part of Christian dogma from the beginning.

René Pruvost, a disciple of Émile Legouis, in *Robert Greene et ses romans* (Les Belles Lettres) exemplifies the best traditions of French scholarship and gives us the first authoritative monograph on this subject. Both the personality of Greene and his prose fictions are rich in apparent contradictions or ambiguities, and contemporaneous judgments upon him, as well as modern ones, have been highly confusing and unconvincing. Pruvost skillfully steers a middle course between the violent condemnation of Greene by Harvey and other Elizabethans, and the sentimental admiration of Brydges and Grosart. Undeniably this author, who moralized overmuch in his writings, forsook his wife and lived in debauchery. He was not guiltless, but neither was he totally insincere. Typical product of both the Renaissance and the Reformation, he vacillated between reckless indulgence and genuine remorse. The inconsistencies are reflected in his works. From the classical revival he took, not high intellectual seriousness, but its least noble traits. In the legends of the gods of Greece, he saw mainly the erotic or fantastic features; for true history or geography he had no sense; too often he indulged in romanesque themes, facile and shallow characterization, and rhetorical edification. But he had at least one essential quality of the novelist,—he could captivate the attention of his reader. The parts of his tales were rarely original, but his manner of composing them into a whole frequently was so. In *Morando*, *Farewell to Women*, and elsewhere he created interest by depicting women who, in their relations towards fathers, lovers, and husbands exhibited a noteworthy degree of independence and frankness (and this adumbrated a characteristic of the world of Shakespeare). And in the story of the Duke Valdracko in *Planeto-machia* he left a tragic tale of the highest class. This study is richly documented. Among the valuable appendices is found "Jupiter's Tragedy," which Grosart omitted from his edition. The

fanciful and vagabond mind of Greene would, I think, have been delighted could he have foreseen that in the course of time the best appreciation of his work would be composed in romantic Algiers, where its author is stationed.

Samuel C. Chew's *The Crescent and the Rose* (Oxford U. Pr.) considers fictitious elements, as well as true ones, in travelers' tales from Hakluyt to Purchas.

SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.—The *Critical Bibliography of Editions of Don Quixote* to 1917 (Harv. U. Pr.), compiled by Benages and Fonbuene, was continued to 1937 by the former before his recent death, and has been edited by J. D. M. Ford and C. T. Keller (Harv. U. Pr.).—Mrs. Helen P. Houck (*PMLA.*, liv, 422) shows that Mabbe, in his English translations of the *Celestina* was untrue to the spirit and style of the original and consistently suppressed the religious passages.—Grant McColley gives us a good edition of Godwin's *Man in the Moone* (Smith Coll. Studies), and in the *Bibliographical Society Transactions* (1937, p. 472) discusses the third edition thereof.—J. P. Camus' novel *Iphigène*, and its relations to Polish history, are set forth by Julius Krzyzanowski and Fletcher Henderson (*TLS.*, Apr. 9, 1938; Feb. 4, 1939).—Dorothy McDougall presents a detailed and judicious biography of Madeleine de Scudéry (Methuen); and Spire Pitou, Jr., a thorough study of the sources, structure, and reputation of La Calprènedé's *Faramond* (Johns Hopkins Pr.).

Jack Lindsay's *John Bunyan: Maker of Myths* (Methuen) is sprightly in style and not without some substantial merits,—such as the disclosure of the important place which the story of Esau selling his birthright played in the seventeenth-century controversies. But to anyone historically minded this will prove an exasperating book. Its point of view is indicated in this sentence: "When Bunyan constructed his system of grace, he devised an ideology closely related to the social processes in which he and his class, the dispossessed peasantry on the edge of the petty-bourgeois, were involved" (p. 112). To Lindsay, the decisive factor in Bunyan's life was his so-called "proletarian" and "pre-industrialist" status; his religious beliefs and dreams were relatively unimportant derivatives of his economic and social status. One would enjoy hearing Bunyan, a master of invective, comment on that assertion,—provided he could be made to understand it, which is doubtful. Lindsay ignores the researches of Harold Golder and W. Y. Tindall (cf. *MLN.*, li, 248), and is therefore insufficiently equipped to discuss Bunyan's reading. He is convinced that he has revealed to us a

new Bunyan, but in my opinion he has merely shown what Bunyan might have become could he have read Karl Marx.—F. Mott Harrison, on the occasion of the 250th anniversary of Bunyan's death, gave his fine collection of Bunyaniana to the Bedford Public Library, which has issued an illustrated catalogue of the more than eight hundred items.

EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.—Kenneth C. Slagle's *English Country Squire as Depicted in English Prose Fiction from 1740 to 1800* (Diss. U. Penn.), examining six-score of novels, finds that most of them agreed as to the character, opinions, and manner of life of the typical squire. A minority was chiefly concerned with representing him as decadent in comparison with his robust seventeenth-century predecessor. But the majority, and this included nearly all the novelists still read to-day, were more interested in his relation to the contemporaneous than to the past. The composite portrait was not a flattering one. The squire did not appear as an exemplar of the beneficial effects of country life. He was "morally and emotionally unstable, unintelligent, reactionary, striving to stem or divert the natural course of progress." The causes of this hostility, Dr. Slagle believes, lay partly in a growing revolt of the urban middle-class against the snobbishness of the squirearchy, and partly in the development of radical social theories. This is a useful survey and on the whole a reliable one, although there are indications that the author has not always taken care to use the best editions of the works considered. Slagle burkes the interesting question to what degree the novelists' depiction of the squire is accurate and just; and there is, therefore, still room for a study which shall test the historical value of the fictional accounts by comparing them with true records.

Rosamond Bayne-Powell's *English Child in the Eighteenth Century* (John Murray), delightfully written and charmingly illustrated, has two chapters here pertinent,—“Children's Books” and “Some Children in Eighteenth Century Fiction.” Mrs. Powell finds Miss Edgeworth's tales incomparably the best in their day, and speaks some words in defence or extenuation of the nursery pabulum, so abhorrent to Charles Lamb, prepared by Mrs. Barbauld. A parade of fictitious children is reviewed,—“Colonel” Jack, little Tom Jones, Humphrey Clinker and Roderick Random, David Simple, Moses Primrose, etc. No general conclusions are drawn, but the impression is given that Sarah Fielding's Camilla was justified in sarcastically declaring that it was “the method of most wise parents to use their little ones as if they were laying plots to secure their hearty aversion to the end of their lives.”

Two bibliographical compilations have appeared, neither of them entirely satisfactory. The larger in scope is Andrew Block's *The English Novel, 1740-1850: a Catalogue including Prose Romances, Short Stories, and Translations of Foreign Fictions* (Grafton). It seems clear that this huge ingathering depends not upon a direct examination of the thousands of books that are listed but largely upon second-hand sources of information often imperfect. Some of the many errors in dates, titles, attribution, etc. are given in *TLS.*, Mch. 25, 1939. It is impossible to discern on what principles some items were included and others of the same kind omitted. — Much less extensive, and better done, is Harold W. Streeter's *Eighteenth Century English Novel in French Translation: a Bibliographical Study* (Inst. of French Studies). This lists over five hundred titles, arranged by various genres or groups. Some of the mistakes are corrected by Donald F. Bond in a valuable review of this work (*MP.*, xxxv, 457). Though Streeter's subtitle suggests that he regards his bibliographical contribution relatively the more important, his lengthy introductory interpretation is a useful outline of the movement. It does not exaggerate the effect of the English novel upon the French, and rightly regards Prévost as a greater influence than Richardson.

The first volume, *A Tale of a Tub*, in Herbert Davis's projected *Shakespeare Head Swift* (Blackwell), is textually not so important as the later volumes are likely to be, because in this exceptional instance a sound edition (Guthkelch and Nichol Smith) has been available. The aim is "to provide a text of the works giving, not the earliest form of the written manuscript or first printed edition, but the final corrected and revised versions which appeared during Swift's lifetime." The editor has enjoyed the assistance of Harold Williams, expert in this difficult field (cf. the account of his library, *TLS.*, Aug. 27, 1939). The great need is an edition of *Gulliver's Travels*, conformable with what has been recently discovered concerning the final authorized text; and that is to be the eleventh volume of the Shakespeare Head edition.—W. F. Trench and K. B. Garratt discuss Swift marginalia found in copies of Macky's *Memoirs* (*Library*, xix).—D. E. Baughan argues that an enthusiastic passage in Sidney's *Defence of Poesie* about the nobility of horses may have helped to inspire the idea of the Houyhnhnms (*ELS.*, v, 207).—Edith Sitwell's *I Live Under A Black Sun* (Gollancz), and Lewis Gibb's *Vanessa and the Dean* (Dent), are novels; but each is so serious an attempt to interpret Swift's life and character that they deserve the attention of scholars.

Richard Steele's *Spectator* story of the Indian maiden whose

ungrateful English lover sold her into slavery was popular during a century in England, Germany, and France; and gave issue to many prose fictions, poems, and plays. The chief of these have been collected and discussed by Lawrence M. Price in an *Inkle and Yarico Album* (U. of California).

A closer study of Defoe's political and economic ideas is facilitated by the Facsimile Text Society's monumental reproduction in twenty-two volumes of *The Review*, thoroughly edited by A. W. Secord.—John R. Moore's *Defoe in the Pillory, and Other Studies* (Indiana U.) sheds light on both biographical and literary problems. Defoe's humiliating sentence to the pillory is shown to have been owing to the personal grudge his judges bore him. New sources for works known to be by Defoe are pointed out,—e. g., for *Roxana*; but more important is the clarification of Defoe's relationship (sometimes left vague by Dottin) to narratives hitherto only hesitatingly associated with his name. Moore concerns himself in such cases both with the sources of the problematic narratives and with their style and ideas; he arrives at definite conclusions about the authorship; and, as a rule, these seem acceptable. About one-sixth of the *Voyage of Don Manuel Gonzales* appears to have been originally from Defoe's hand. To him must be ascribed *Robert Drury's Journal*, "in style, in method, and in ideas a characteristic romance of the author of *Robinson Crusoe*" (p. 104). (In this case, more detailed accounts of the sources and comparison of them with the *Journal* would have been welcome.) Most important of all, to Defoe should be credited that *General History of Pirates*, nominally by the mythical "Charles Johnson," which was to prove very influential upon many historians and biographers, and which was the delight of several great story-tellers, including Scott and Stevenson, who did not know by whom it was written. Moore finds that, although it is in the main fairly reliable history, Defoe intensified its interest by inserting imaginary speeches, dialogues, reflections, and incidents, which his supposed informants could hardly have succeeded in learning or witnessing. To Defoe, who is shown to have been an authority on Juan Fernandez three-and-a-half years before Selkirk returned therefrom, the *History of the Pirates* was the culmination of a lifelong interest in those who go down to the sea in ships.—Dr. Philip Gosse's great collection of pirate-literature (described in *TLS.*, Dec. 3, 1938) has been given to the National Maritime Museum at Greenwich.

Henry C. Fisher's *Realism and Morality in English Fiction Before 1750* (U. Pittsburgh Diss.) maintains that Fielding's "moralism" was more largely traditional than Richardson's.—

Paul Hazard's "Un Romantique de 1730: l'Abbé Prévost," a contribution to the Harvard Tercentary symposium, *Authority and the Individual*, is a brilliant summary of pre-romantic characteristics which should prove widely useful.—R. B. Mowat's *Jean Jacques Rousseau* is exceptionally judicious in his attitude towards his author's character and works. James H. Warner, in a praiseworthy article (*PMLA.*, lii, 803) shows that although the English translation of the *Nouvelle Héloïse* was inferior to the original, the reception of that novel in England was on the whole, and with reservations, predominantly favorable. Students of Rousseau's ideas should not overlook *The Development of Political Theory* (Allen and Unwin) by the distinguished scholar Otto von Guericke, which traces some of Rousseau's principles back to Althusius.—Eugène E. Rovillain (*PMLA.*, lii, 374), armed with a battery of quotations from Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, etc., argues that many of the ideas in Voltaire's *Zadig* are derived from the Stoical tradition.

George M. Kahrl (Abst. Harv. Diss., 1938) studies the influence upon Smollett of his reading travel-books, and of his own travels; and finds that they gave his works "autobiographical foundation, emphasis on comparative manners, objective point of view," etc.—In Charles Johnstone's *Chrysal; or, the Adventures of a Guinea*, we have the chief contemporary account of the notorious Medmenham Abbey. A serious attempt to ascertain the true facts about the matter is made in Ronald Fuller's *Hell-Fire Francis* (Chatto & Windus), but the author admits that it is almost impossible to solve the problem.—The first thorough study of Frances Sheridan is made by Samuel P. Chew, Jr. (Abst. Harv. Diss., 1938). He finds her *Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph* related to the writings of Prévost, Riccoboni, and Baculard d'Arnaud (Prévost translated the *Memoirs*).—John Carter describes two American collections of Beckfordiana (*Colophon*, new ser., i); and Bertha C. Slade presents in *Maria Edgeworth: a Bibliographical Tribute* a work of basic value for her author's life as well as for her writings. Robert G. Mood, Jr., in *Maria Edgeworth's Apprenticeship* (Abst. U. of Ill., 1938) pays especial attention to her reading and the influence of her father upon her.—M. Ray Adams' "Helen Maria Williams and the French Revolution" (*Wordsworth and Coleridge*, Princeton U. Pr.) places Miss Williams, who wrote the tale on which *The Lady of Lyons* was based, in as favorable a light as is justly possible. *Four New Letters of Mary Wollstonecraft and Helen Maria Williams* (written during the Reign of Terror) are edited by B. P. Kurtz and C. C. Autrey (U. of California Pr.).

Robert B. Heilman's *America In English Fiction, 1760-1800: The Influence of the American Revolution* (U. Penn. Pr.) deals with about seventy-five novels. Few of these are known today,—Pratt's *Emma Cobbett*, Charlotte Smith's *Old Manor House* and *Celestina*, Pye's *Democrat*, perhaps, but none of the others. A few of the resurrected ones Heilman finds readable, e. g., *Jonathan Corncob* (1787) and *Berkeley Hall* (1796); but most of them lacked literary value. Some of these brought in the Revolution merely because it was of contemporaneous interest (a Mrs. Parsons' *Voluntary Exile*, in five volumes, "did the war in detail from beginning to end"); others took a critical attitude towards it, and indicated that it did not receive popular support; and still others really endeavored to estimate the character of American life. The style of this monograph is clumsy and labored, and the method shows a prosaic penchant for statistics. Nevertheless certain results of genuine value are gained. Heilman demonstrates that these works illustrate the beginnings of a middle phase between the Renaissance concept of America as the Promised Land and the ultra-modern concept of it as the scene of mankind's worst failure. The democratic principles of the revolutionaries are admired; and, although the hardships of frontier life are by this time too well known to be ignored, the new world is still presented as a land of opportunity from the standpoint not only of economics but also of civilization. This qualified hopefulness does not preclude, in some of the novelists, satirical portrayal of the cruder American types and manners.—A welcome reproduction of an early American novel is the Facsimile Text Society's of Mrs. Foster's *The Coquette* (1797), edited by Herbert R. Brown.

Miss J. M. S. Tompkins' *The Polite Marriage* (Macmillan) is not a collection of essays on neglected authors without any unifying principle: each of these minor writers shows an unusual personality, as well as an aspect of the taste of his day. Among them are Richard and Elizabeth Griffith, whose love-letters before and after marriage were published by themselves as *Letters Between Henry and Frances* to show forth their belief that the constant exercise of "tenderness and politeness" towards one another will "refine Matrimony into Amour." There are also the Bristol Milkwoman, Ann Yearsley, of whom Southey wrote respectfully, with her romance *The Royal Captives, or the Man in the Iron Mask*; and the author (perhaps the draughtsman, John Carter) of *The Scotch Parents* an autobiographic tale of a low-class love-affair. That strange but true "original," James White, learned but ill-fated, is here, with his historical romances that incongruously mix sound

learning, eloquence, and sarcasm. Finally we have Mary Hays, the female philosopher and persistent man-hunter, who in *Emma Courtney* justified amorous passion on the ground of its "social utility," and in *Victim of Prejudice* protested against the injustice of society in punishing "an involuntary lapse from chastity." These studies are in most cases the first, and in all cases the best, on their subjects; and throughout they are marked by that Austenish grace and sense of humor which made Miss Tomkins' *Popular Novel* so delightful (cf. *MLN.*, xlviii, 377).

Montague Summer's *The Gothic Quest* (Fortune Pr.) is the first part of what is to be a history of the "Gothic Novel" in two or more volumes. Its author has for decades been a collector and reader of tales of terror, and gives us much first-hand information concerning their substance and the circumstances of their publication, which is especially valuable with respect to those fictions of which only a few copies are extant. Another substantial merit is the frequent use of contemporaneous criticisms of the novels. A quarter of this volume is devoted to M. G. Lewis (for corrections in that section, see Michael Sadleir, *TLS.*, Jan. 7, 1939). Preceding that we have a discussion of romanticism, an account of publishers and circulating libraries, and a survey of the main French and German influences. On matters of fact Summers will be consulted, often with profit; but in matters of historical and critical interpretation, he is often unsatisfactory. In one place he explains at great length that romanticism, of which the Gothic novel is an issue, is supernaturalism, and in its best form mysticism. Yet elsewhere he regards the genre as escape-literature, which he defends as freeing us from "carking cares of a bitter actuality." His judgment is often warped by eccentric notions or prejudices: authors who portray Catholic institutions as possibly admitting occasional evils are necessarily wrong; werewolves are actual creatures, of which it is "literally true" that they emit a stench; Mrs. Nesta Williams' *World Revolution* is credible history, etc., etc. He is ignorant of some important scholarly works in the field, writes about Prévost without having consulted J. R. Foster, and vainly tries to distinguish between seventeenth-century historical fiction and later kinds without knowing Gerhard Buck's differentiation between "historisierende Romane" and "historische" (cf. *MLN.*, xlvii, 112). His attitude towards his predecessors,—Railo, Brauchli, Miss Tompkins, etc.,—is habitually ungrateful and contemptuous. They may, however, console themselves by observing that in Summers' opinion Coleridge, too, does not know the truth as it is given to M. S. to know it.

Walter F. Wright's *Sensibility in English Prose Fiction: 1760-1814* (U. of Ill.) bears the subtitle *A Reinterpretation*. The author does not pretend to have discovered important new materials, nor does he disagree with the commonly accepted belief that during the period he treats the novel tended to become increasingly sentimental or romantic. The questions he raises concern the causes for this development. Was the change chiefly due to social or economic forces? Is it sufficiently explained by saying that from time to time novelists turned to new materials which in themselves were romantic? To such questions his answer is No. To him the process is the gradual development of a spirit or temper. It is less a matter of the logical history of thought than of the natural history of feeling. As we proceed from decade to decade, we find that the earlier novels depict, cultivate, and satisfy the gentle emotions; that the craving for stronger and deeper ones gradually arises, until in the end the most violent and tragic passions are demanded. Wright shows this emotional ascent affecting the novelists' choice of subjects, tone of treatment, admiration for some types of men and women and contempt for others, and ultimately their views as to what human life was and what it should be. If they professed a philosophy, it was often the rationalization of instinctive feelings. Out of this method of approach, there arise, it seems to me, many new and sound distinctions between such novelists as Walpole, Mrs. Radcliffe, Lewis, Beckford, and Maturin. Wright's work represents a reaction towards the school of taste, and is not merely a history but also an essay in creative criticism.

ERNEST BERNBAUM

University of Illinois

REVIEWS

Die Wissenschaft von der Dichtung. System und Methodenlehre der Literaturwissenschaft, I: Werk und Dichter. Von JULIUS PETERSEN. Berlin: Junker und Dünnhaupt Verlag, 1939. Pp. xvi, 516.

Petersen's book is, as its title indicates, a treatise on methods. We might conceive the task of writing such a book in various ways: (1) a description of a single acceptable method as we might have a "Methodenlehre der qualitativen Untersuchung der Metalle"; (2) a description of several conceivable methods with an examination of

their advantages and disadvantages; (3) a review of what has been done in solving particular problems at various times or by various scholars and the consequent disclosure of the methods by implication rather than by direct statement. As I have already hinted, the first variety of a methodology is found more frequently in the natural sciences rather than in literary history. We should seek to answer the question: What elements of such a handbook would be useful to the student of literary history? Such a handbook has at least two elements which are easily obscured in a treatise of the second or third sort, viz, it will ordinarily state the problem clearly and succinctly as a problem which calls for a solution and it will ordinarily name the tools and the procedures to be used. In the field of the methodology of literary history André Morize's *Problems and Methods of Literary History with special reference to modern French Literature*, Boston, 1922, is a conspicuously successful example of a textbook of this first variety. On the whole, Petersen's book represents a combination of the second and third varieties. For example, he describes (pp. 303-6) three ways of stating the facts of a poet's life and suggests the advantages and disadvantages which attach to each of them. In the immediately following section (pp. 306-8), he follows the pragmatic plan of the third variety of methodology and reviews what has been accomplished in discovering the facts of a poet's life. He does not state the possible ways of discovering these facts and then weigh their relative values. Here and there, the description and evaluation of methods might have been sharper and more positive. Thus, for example, the section "Traumleben" (pp. 394-400) recites a number of facts from the theorizing of Romanticists regarding dreams and the experiences of such poets as Hebbel, Chatterton, Tolstoi, Goethe, and many another; but the section leaves me rather uncertain as to what I, as a historian of literature, might do with any particular dream or poet. On the other hand, I shall not call for bald and uninspired as well as uninspiring statistics of the human spirit, and Petersen wisely warns us against that danger (pp. 341, 401).

Petersen has collected an amazing number of illustrations from the literary history of Europe since the Reformation. His learning does not stop or even linger momentarily at the boundaries of Germany. Without the slightest apparent hesitation he selects an illustration from Elizabethan England, Germany at the time of rationalism, Germany in the period of romanticism, or from Goethe. French literature is perhaps not mentioned as frequently as English literature, but the deficiency, if we could even call it a deficiency, is more than balanced by the abundance of references to French writers on the theory of literary history. Petersen's book can teach us much. It is not to be read hastily, for its values will appear most abundantly when the reader has made an outline of the text, has rearranged the materials for his own purposes, and has added to

them from his own store. I suggest these steps not to imply that the reader should try to improve upon Petersen's arrangement but to make clear that the lessons which he would teach can only be learned by hard work and systematic analysis.

Petersen deals but briefly with the scholarly tools and might have dealt with them even more briefly. A systematic use of R. F. Arnold's *Allgemeine Bücherkunde zur neueren deutschen Literaturgeschichte*, 3d edition, Berlin, 1931, might have supplied helpful references now and again, and other standard works of reference might have been introduced upon occasion. Thus, for example, the bibliography of lists of incunabula (pp. 469-70, note on p. 69) might have been replaced by references to Georg Schneider, *Handbuch der Bibliographie*¹ or Fritz Milkau, *Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft*;² the catalogue of "Anonymen-Lexika" (p. 474) by Arnold, pp. 203-4, 214 and Schneider, pp. 449-67; the references on the history of various foreign metrical forms (p. 493, note on p. 246) by the citing of pertinent sections in Andreas Heusler, *Deutsche Versgeschichte*³ and articles in the *Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturgeschichte*. These three bibliographical notes form only a negligible portion of Petersen's book, and that fact is significant. My mention of them is to show what Petersen intended or rather what he did not intend to do. Specifically, he did not intend to supply the student with a collection of tools systematically arranged for use. He wished to discuss the methods and not the practice of literary history.

ARCHER TAYLOR

University of California

Briefwechsel zwischen George und Hofmannsthal. Erschienen bei GEORG BONDI, Berlin [1939]. Pp. 262.

A publication of unusual importance, these letters exchanged between Stefan George and Hugo von Hofmannsthal between the years 1891 and 1906, not only because they are the first intimately biographical document from the pen of George to appear, but because they give us in spite of their laconism a considerable insight into the literary struggle of the time, into the personal and pathetic struggle of two men who admire, revere each other's works and have no approach to each other's personality. Painful letters, perhaps the most tactless letters two great poets ever exchanged, and yet letters which fill us with respect for their ever renewed attempt to find a way to each other for the sake of their mission in the renaissance of German lyricism.

¹ 4th ed., Berlin, 1930, pp. 85-103.

² Leipzig, 1931, I, 413-16, § 154.

³ "Grundriss der germanischen Philologie," 3d ed., VIII, 1-3, Berlin, 1925-29.

The book begins with foreboding verses of Hofmannsthal to "Herrn Stefan George, einem der vorübergeht" and the characteristic questioning of George's "bleibe ich für Sie nichts mehr als einer der vorübergeht?" It ends with a somewhat petulant request of Hofmannsthal that George restore to him the right of free disposition over his small collection of lyrics privately printed, and the cutting reply of George reminding the other of the words of their contract. Throughout the book George, the older, with an unrelenting will to gather around him men of lyrical promise and to set up a literary dictatorship, to educate the younger poets to the consciousness of their sacred mission, to force an exemplary production, woos the younger man in whom he sees real genius, the only genius, perhaps, beside himself. Hofmannsthal, with greater psychological insight, bound by ties of family, of friendship, rooted in Austrian life, broader in sympathies, tolerant of non-literary aspirations, hedges, retreats, evades, temporizes, leaves to "Tyche" and time what absolute will seeks to force. He yields to mood, place, and season, to influence of tradition and men; he is the humble vessel of his God but does not command his muse; he mislays his manuscripts and shrinks from a pretentious printing; he vacillates between deepest discouragement and highest exultation in his craft.

George knows only one task: "He who belongs to no art, may he claim at all to belong to life? How? At best in barbarian times." Whenever Hofmannsthal yields to George's wooing, the latter takes him to task, for his Austrian attachments, which he abhors, for his compromising with lower literary currents, which he loathes, even for unprecise syntactical expression of which he disapproves. George's grotesque tactlessness is impersonal, dictatorial, issues from the postulates of his ideals. Yet he can find touching words of encouragement when Hofmannsthal is seized by melancholy. Hofmannsthal's tactlessness is reaction, resentment against intrusion, issues from a desire to defend his own personal life and emotions. Thus he often seems weakest when we sympathize with him most strongly.

Their paths separate when Hofmannsthal turns to the stage, which George despises. For how could he whose strength is the monologue and whose way and voice are ever his own, recognize the dialectics of tragic dilemma. Hofmannsthal's Protean genius fills the soul of every one of his figures. Yet, Hofmannsthal's last hero, the Prince in his *Turm*, uncompromising as George before the dictatorship of brute force, dies like the latter in tragic solitude, for "Eitel ist alles außer der Rede zwischen Geist und Geist" (*Der Turm*).

Thanks are due to the publisher for his unsparing art of book craft; to the editor, Mr. Robert Boehringer, for his careful, discrete, and instructive annotation.

ERNST FEISE

Giovanni Boccaccio: Il Filocolo. A cura di SALVATORE BATTAGLIA.
Bari: Laterza, 1938. Pp. 600. Lire 60.

Giovanni Boccaccio: Le Rime. L'Amorosa Visione. La Caccia di Diana. A cura di VITTORE BRANCA. Bari: Laterza, 1939.
Pp. 407. Lire 35. (*Scrittori d'Italia*, nn. 167, 169).

Owing both to a program of some years' standing on the part of the Crusca Academy, and to the now happily revised program of publication of the *Scrittori d'Italia* series under the competent direction of Luigi Russo, the works of Giovanni Boccaccio will soon stand complete in new editions far more satisfactory than the century-old Moutier *Opere complete* which has done long service to scholars; but a dubious service in the light of the versions which renewed critical effort is now bringing to print.

First in appearance has been the volume of the Laterza series edited by Vincenzo Pernicone: *Il Filostrato e il Ninfale Fiesolano*. This was followed by a monumental and definitive edition of the *Teseida*, the careful and long-expected work of Salvatore Battaglia, who was able to profit by the discovery and proof, of Vandelli, that the Laurentian ms. containing the work with lengthy glosses is all in the hand of Boccaccio himself. This critical edition has appeared as the second volume in the series contemplated by the Crusca (Sansoni, Florence) with full critical apparatus, discussion of language and style, with glossary. The Crusca editions are the goal of all the new editorial work, which in these other cases has given a tentative statement of its various progress in the *Scrittori d'Italia* volumes.

Outside the scope of the present review, these two volumes which have already received adequate treatment elsewhere, are doubtless those of most immediate interest to Chaucer scholars. It may be that, on the basis of recorded variants, it will be possible for such scholars to determine more closely to which particular family of the manuscripts of each work belonged those which served Chaucer as sources. Such a possibility is indeed claimed by Pernicone for the *Filostrato* (p. 373, n. 1); and such a determination might lead to a precision of date of some factual consequences in the inter-relations of the two writers.

Next in order in the *Scrittori d'Italia* series will be the *Elegia di Madonna Fiammetta* already announced; and before many years pass, no doubt, the remaining minor works will appear, as well as a more satisfactory edition of the *Decameron* than the present two volumes of the series contain as edited over ten years ago by A. F. Massera (which, in spite of shortcomings easily discernible, still remains the best available text).

Neither of the volumes before us is claimed as a definitive critical text by its editor. Both, judging from remarks in the notes,

represent that stage mentioned above as progress toward the status of definitive Crusca texts.

For the present text of the *Filocolo*, Battaglia has limited his collation to manuscripts in Florence and Rome, all of which happen to be of the fifteenth century, ten in number, with no autograph involved. In spite of the practical limitations thus imposed on the text, even a hasty check with the Moutier and the De Ferri editions (the latter Torino, 1927), aided by passages quoted to this purpose (p. 571 ff.), shows the strangely contaminated version of those editions, now happily corrected in a host of important passages. In fact, there is not a page that in some way or other does not clearly improve its reading.

Sig. Battaglia, now well-known for a number of important Boccaccio studies, has not left out of the picture his own sense of the literary value of the work he has spent so much time on. His final *nota* is extended to a brief critical estimate of the *Filocolo* which may rightfully figure in the history of criticism of that work (pp. 581 ff.) and as an extension of his acute remarks which appeared in the *Archivum Romanicum* (vol. XIX, 1935). A useful feature of his volume, not appearing in former editions of the work, is the Index of names mentioned, good reminder of the range of multiple digressions and surprising flight of fancy which surrounds this once simple story of Florio and *Biancofiore* in the garb it acquired at the youthful hands of Boccaccio.

A very few, probably insignificant, errors have crept into this lengthy text: s'oddormentano (s'addormentano) p. 120; io mio piango (io mi piango) p. 207; nostri (vostri) p. 336; d'anni (danni) p. 422; petesse (potesse) p. 500; già e (è) cotanto p. 551.

Two of the three texts which make up the volume edited by Vittore Branca, the *Rime* and the *Caccia di Diana*, had already been published in what was claimed as a definitive version by Massera. Branca now demonstrates that both of the Massera versions could be improved. Boccaccio's *Rime* are a thorny problem. No collection of them in the hand of the author is extant and their dispersion has very nearly created a separate critical problem for each single composition, the tentative statement of which problem appears in Branca's *Nota*. He has had, moreover, the good judgment to print here those compositions of doubtful authenticity, but of literary merit equal to those of certain attribution, which Massera had excluded. These are, of course, strictly recognized as questionably Boccaccio's. Added to these individual problems is the comprehensive one of arrangement, which in the absence of Boccaccio's expressed desire, will remain a tempting if idle problem. Recognizing the absolute lack of any criterion for this arrangement, Branca has kept that order given to the *Rime* by Massera, all the while questioning the biographical norm which he allowed to guide him.

As with the *Rime*, the text of the *Amorosa Visione* is here given as a *primo passo* toward the definitive one.

The recently renewed attempt to prove the *Caccia* to be the earliest work of Boccaccio is represented by an article by Branca himself which preceded this edition (*Annali della R. Scuola Normale di Pisa*, 1939, pp. 278 ff.). However questionable the ultimate proof of such authorship may be (and Branca has given some very good reasons for not doubting it) the text of that work is welcome in this volume on its way, like its companions, to final critical form.

That final form will doubtless exclude a number of useless archaic survivals which have been allowed to stand in this volume, such as: *tengho*, *chui*, *senpre*, etc. Nor is it plain why initial *h* should be allowed to live its questionable life in *hardito*, *honesta*, *habituati*, *horribili*, *humiliati* and *humile* alongside *onorandola*, *ò* (*ho*), *orribil*, and *onesto*. The various forms of *atere* might well be made uniform (eliminating *a'tar*, *Rime* LXXXIX, 5 and *passim* beside *atando*, p. 271, and *atiate*, p. 211).

Since many years may be required for the publication of genuine critical editions of the works of Boccaccio which may stand with as much certainty as the *Teseida* now does, the continued publication of such tentative texts in this handsome series cannot fail to meet with a general welcome.

CHARLES S. SINGLETON

Comicall Satyre and Shakespeare's "Troilus and Cressida." By OSCAR JAMES CAMPBELL. San Marino: Huntington Library, 1938. Pp. x + 246. \$3.00.

The plays particularly considered in Professor Campbell's learned and original book are three by the young Ben Jonson, several by Marston, and Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*,—all dating between 1599 and the death of Elizabeth in 1603. The initial thesis is that these were written "to circumvent a legal prohibition," i. e., the order of June 1, 1599 that "no Satires or Epigrams be printed hereafter." Roughly stated, then, Mr. Campbell's argument is that Jonson in *Every Man out of his Humour* invented a new species of drama, which he termed "Comicall Satyre," for the purpose of bootlegging an equivalent of the proscribed satires and epigrams, and that the laws of this strange hybrid explain the peculiarities of *Troilus and Cressida* no less than those of *Cynthia's Revels*, *Poetaster*, *Antonio and Mellida*, *Jack Drum's Entertainment*, and *What You Will*.

These are all, by the usual standards, rather amorphous plays, and Mr. Campbell has offered valuable clues to their elucidation.

He has devised a very definite formula for their structure and applied it with severity. The formula seems to me to fit best with the earliest play, *Every Man Out*, much less well with *Poetaster*, and least of all with *Troilus and Cressida*, which in accordance with it is defined as "the adventures of two virtuosi in sensuality." But on this play critics always differ, and Mr. Campbell has so generously analyzed my opinion in the matter that he will hardly expect my immediate adhesion to his.

If "Comical Satyre" was recognized as a distinct type of drama in the opening years of the seventeenth century, I do not think its *raison d'être* can be safely found in the perishing of regular non-dramatic satire from the earth. The statement on p. 3 of the present book is: "After 1599 formal satire practically ceased to be written until 1613." Samuel Rowlands seems to have had no notion of this in 1600, when he wrote his epigram to the practicing poets of the day, exhorting them to more and harsher satire:

Good honest Poets, let me crave a boon,
That you would write, I do not care how soon,
Against the bastard humours hourly bred
In every mad-brain'd, wit-worn, giddy head:
At such gross follies do not sit and wink;
Belabour these same gulls with pen and ink!

Rowlands goes on to urge the poets specifically *not* to write for the stage, which he still associates with love, not satire. The history of the book of stinging satires, at the head of which the above epigram appeared, is interesting. It was regularly entered at Stationers' Hall with Mr. Pasfield's license on October 16, 1600, something over a year after the Archbishop and Bishop of London had proclaimed their anathema. A fortnight later (Oct. 29) restraint won a Pyrrhic victory, and it was condemned to be burned. The next year and the year after that stationers were being fined (two-and-sixpence apiece) for purchasing new editions of it. In all, twenty-nine booksellers were fined, and at least five editions, issued between 1600 and 1613, are still extant, including the original 'burnt' one in as many copies as generally survive of such a book. This does not suggest that during the period covered by Mr. Campbell's investigation non-dramatic satire was really difficult to procure. The Stationers' Register will furnish other examples.

It has often been found embarrassing to take the official utterances of British morality quite literally. One remembers that in 1597 the authorities issued an angry decree against the London theatres, commanding the owners "to pluck down quite the stages, galleries, and rooms that are made for people to stand in, and so to deface the same as they may not be employed again to such use." Hence it might be neatly argued that the vogue of poetic satire in 1597-99 was owing to the abolition of a dramatic outlet. But we know it was not so. The stages were not plucked down, and, as Sir

Edmund Chambers quietly remarks, Henslowe's *Diary* notes the resumption of playing two months later.

TUCKER BROOKE

Yale University

Die altenglischen Kenningar, ein Beitrag zur Stilkunde altgermanischer Dichtung. Von HERTHA MARQUARDT. Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1938. Pp. xvi + 238. RM 22.

The work under review was published in the *Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse* (14. Jahr, Heft 3). In it the author makes a substantial contribution to our understanding of kennings. The work was largely modeled on Meissner's well known book, *Die Kenningar der Skalden* (see p. 2 bottom), and gives us a welcome supplement to that important collection. Miss Marquardt did not content herself with critical introduction and systematic list of kennings, however. She gives us, in many cases, exegetical discussions, the meaning of a given kenning being considered in terms of the various contexts in which it occurs. Her volume thus has value for textual criticism and interpretation, as well as for stylistic studies. In the following I will comment briefly on a few points which stand in need of clarification or correction. In her remarks on *wærloga* 'the devil,' the author might have brought out more clearly (p. 11) the fact that Satan was so called because he was thought of as the rebel against God, the treaty-breaker *par excellence*. The equivalents *ādloga* Christ 1604 and *tréowloga* Beowulf 2847 show (as she points out) that the literal meaning of *wærloga* was still felt, and it is doubtful to what extent, if indeed at all, the OE word, when applied to the devil, was understood *im übertragenen Sinne*, rather than in its literal sense. The author seems a bit too fond of deriving OE words from Icelandic (e.g. *þengel* p. 17, *brand* p. 53); I see no justification for such derivations, in the absence of evidence. When the author claims (p. 20) that the base-word of a kenning in OE never describes the form alone of an object, she forgets certain examples which she later adduces: *holmes hring* (p. 64) and *ýða ful* (p. 66), for instance, where *hring* and *ful* both have reference to the horizon (in the latter case the horizon is thought of as the rim of a cup). In *windes full* (p. 76) the reference seems to be, not to the horizon only but to the vault of the heavens (of which the horizon is the rim), the whole being compared to a cup turned upside down and seen from below. If *dægsceald* 'day-shield' means the sun (p. 84), we have another strictly formal comparison: the sun may be called a (round) shield by virtue of its form only. The author's argument (p. 95, note 1) against Kock's interpretation of *wópes hring* therefore cannot be maintained. The *dryhtibearn Dena*

of *Beowulf* 2035 should have been listed on p. 45 (sec. 26); for a discussion of this expansion of the Danish name see *Anglia* LXIII, 107 f.; the author, by a strange slip of the pen (p. 156), makes it a kenning for Ingeld! Vincenti's heretical interpretation of *bearn heofonwara* (p. 48) hardly deserves serious consideration. The etymology of *sioleða* ascribed (p. 64, note 1) to Hoops actually goes back to Bugge, as Klaeber (*Beowulf*, 3d ed., p. 212) duly noted. The author wrongly attributes to OE *rád* the modern meaning 'road' (pp. 69 f.); such a kenning as *brimrád* 'sea' is better associated with *brimhengest* 'ship' (the sea being thought of as a place where riding goes on). The author is surely wrong, too, in giving to *fyrgenstréam* the meaning 'mountain stream' (p. 74). The first element means rather 'mountainous, huge, immense' and the word is a kenning for 'ocean' in *Beowulf* as elsewhere. Common sense tells us that an arm of the sea, not a mountain stream, is the natural object associated with the *fengelád* of *Beowulf* 1359, and this same arm of the sea is referred to in *Beowulf* 2128. Likewise *fyrgenbeam* 'huge tree' and *fyrgenholt* 'huge wood.' See my discussion in *English Studies* xiv, 190 ff. Among the kennings for 'hall' (p. 201) should have been listed the *bu folcbeorna* of *Beowulf* 2220 (see *JEGPh* xxvii, 318 ff.). The author is mistaken when she says (p. 119) that a kenning *hléorberg* is recorded in *Beowulf* 304; this hypothetical word is the product of a needless emendation; see *Medium Ævum* II, 58 f. Berendsohn's bold derivation of *Hjalti* (p. 122, note 2) seems to have been inspired by A. Olrik, *Danmarks Heltedigtning* I, 139. On p. 135, line 9, for III read II. The discussion on p. 142 calls for a reference to my treatment of the subject in *RES* III 269 f. The author incautiously remarks (p. 150 footnote) that *worold*- 'earthly' would be *auf-fallend* in *Beowulf*. But if the poet is allowed to say *woroldcýning* in lines 1684 and 3180, why must he be forbidden to say *worold-ráðend* in line 1142? Klaeber is wiser than Miss Marquardt in not attempting to defend his indefensible emendation. It is overbold to say (p. 190) that Christ is called *engel dryhtnes* in *Rood* 9; this passage is manifestly corrupt, and in the circumstances one must hesitate to attribute to the pious poet so heretical a belief. In the editions of Cook and of Dickins-Ross, to which the author refers (p. 217), the passage is duly emended, and the author ought not to have passed these conjectures over in silence.

KEMP MALONE

The Battle of Brunanburh, edited by A. CAMPBELL. London: Heinemann, 1938. Pp. xvi + 168. 10/6.

This is the most thorough edition of *Brunanburh* ever published. It lacks a bibliography, to be sure, but the "list of books used" and

the notes, taken together, give the student information enough for all practical purposes. Here the edition reminds one of the *Widsith* of Chambers, which also lacks a bibliography. The many appendices likewise remind one of Chambers. Nevertheless, Campbell differs from Chambers in that he is primarily concerned with his poem, not with its setting and background except as these throw light on the poem (the reverse holds of Chambers' *Widsith*, of course). The editor has done a careful and accurate piece of work. In an introduction of 80 pages he gives a full treatment of (A) the text, (B) the meter, (C) the poem and its place in OE literature and (D) the poem as history and the site of the battle. There follows a diplomatic text (MS A) with variant readings from the other MSS. Then comes the critical text (pp. 93-5) together with the notes (pp. 96-121); these are followed by the glossary and six appendices. Editor and publishers are both to be congratulated on this book.

A few details may be briefly commented on. The editor usually speaks of the OE Chron. (pp. 1, 43, 60), but once he calls it the AS Chron. (p. xi); why not be consistent? The best name for this work is that suggested by F. P. Magoun, namely, OE Annals. The punctuation now and then strikes one as odd, as on pp. 13, 17, 32, 34, 60, 65. The use of the term "letter" (p. 32; cf. p. 79) for the initial sound of a stressed syllable is unhappy. No statistics are given (p. 32) for those cases in which only one arsis of the onverse alliterates (but cf. p. 21 f.). If the editor is right in thinking that the poem exemplifies an "artificial preservation" or a "resurrection of the old style" (p. 38), then his doubts about palatal and velar *g* alliterating (p. 33) are not justified. I cannot agree with the editor that Simeon's *Guthredi* is an error for *Guthfridi* (p. 49). See Noreen, *Altisl. Gram.*, 4th ed., pp. 70, 213. Simeon's form is particularly interesting in that it wants u-mutation. The by-name *rauði* given to Anlaf in the *Egilssaga* is derivable from *Guðrøðr*, the second element of the name being used as a pet-form and identified with *røð*, the East Scandinavian equivalent of Icelandic *rauðr* 'red.' The editor is therefore wrong in saying that the saga "sheds no light on the question" (p. 50); the Ólafr of the saga was surely the son of Guthfrith, alias *Guðrøðr* or *Røði*. The D reading *eoforan* 7 was hardly from an earlier *eaforan* (p. 97). A phonetic explanation of *gealgodon* and the like (p. 97) might have been given. The note on *andlang* (p. 104) should have included a reference to the gloss *anlangcempa* 'miles ordinarius.' With the form *Anelaf* (p. 106), compare *Anlafus* (p. 155); we have here, it would seem, Anglicized and Latinized forms of the name (note the *Onela* of *Beowulf*). The emendation of *flotan* to *flotena* (p. 108) is hardly right. The original may have read *flotana* and *Sceotta*; if so, apocope to *flotan* would be easy, and this apocope would be disguised by the use of the usual abbreviation for

the conjunctive particle. The editor mentions this possibility, yet emends to *flotena* nevertheless, although the proper emendation in such case would surely be *flotana*. The A reading *fealene* (p. 109) is not well described as odd; we have here a phonetic spelling (the scribe himself pronounced unstressed *o* as *e*). On *Ira land* (p. 116), see *Speculum* v, 143.

KEMP MALONE

BRIEF MENTION

Le Thème de Phèdre et d'Hippolyte dans la littérature française. Par WINIFRED NEWTON. Paris: Droz, 1939. Pp. 167. A dissertation treating a familiar theme, this work presents only a small amount of new material. One can say, however, that Miss N. has made a careful and extensive study of the subject and presented her results intelligently and concisely. The title is somewhat misleading as in certain periods she limits herself to the theme of Phaedra and Hippolytus, while in others she discusses other stories of virtuous stepsons and wayward stepmothers. In the latter case her choice seems arbitrary, including, for instance, Tristan's *Mort de Chrispe*, but excluding Camus's *Agathonphile* and the play that Françoise Pascal derived from it. The bulk of her work, pp. 21-124, is devoted to Garnier, La Pinelière, Gilbert, Bidar, Pradon and Racine. A single chapter, pp. 125-38, is not enough to discuss "de Racine à nos jours." While she usually shows good judgment in handling her theme, I must take issue with her on one point. She attacks (p. 103) M. Gros for speaking of jealousy as supplying in *Phèdre* the motive for calumny and goes on to say that, if Phèdre had confessed in IV, 4, she would not have saved Hippolytus. "C'est là, justement, le coup de génie de Racine, qui dédaigne comme une banalité dramatique . . . la jalousie, ressort de l'action!" Racine, who had recently created Eriphile, would not have thanked her for this praise. As a matter of fact, neither Theseus, nor his wife, nor Aricie considers the prayer to Neptune irrevocable.¹ Jealousy is not the basis of calumny in the tragedy, but jealousy, added to other emotions, prevents Phèdre from inducing her husband to revoke his prayer. Otherwise Racine would not have introduced her into IV, 4. He was too good a classical craftsman for that.²

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

¹ Cf. vv. 1191-2, 1196, 1315, and especially 1336-7: ". . . Il en est temps encor."

² P. 72; the actors of "Monseigneur le Prince" must be those of Condé,

The Amazing Career of Sir Giles Overreach. By ROBERT HAMILTON BALL. Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. xiv + 468. \$5.00. If it seems a trifle ironic that, of them all, Massinger should be the one to inspire a monument like this, the answer is that (excepting Shakespeare, whose monuments are everywhere) he was the only English dramatist before Gay to write a play that would maintain itself in the repertory down to our own time. Despite the secondary claim of its title page that this is "A History of the Stage," Professor Ball's lively and handsomely illustrated volume is essentially the chronicle of *A New Way to Pay Old Debts* on the British and American boards, though numerous and entertaining asides relate to—shall we say?—subordinate concerns of those theatres. It is a fanatical book; on this subject its author is an Ancient Mariner; and you will gratefully discover, when you begin to read him, that you cannot choose but hear.

H. S.

The Relation of Molière to Restoration Comedy. By JOHN WILCOX. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938. Pp. xii + 242. \$3.00. This sober and workmanlike study corrects and replaces Miles's *The Influence of Molière on Restoration Comedy*. After a sketch of the debate on native versus French contributions and a formulation of method designed to discriminate between mere borrowing and genuine influence, Professor Wilcox runs rapidly over the English pieces, of minor as well as of major dramatists. He concludes that Molière "made no significant contribution to the type of comedy we associate with the Restoration." It "grew in the rich soil of British social and dramatic conventions from seeds sown by Ben Jonson." Precisely how it grew still awaits detailed study; we need more dissertations on post-Jonsonian and Restoration comedy. Meanwhile Mr. Wilcox's negative report will be read with grateful interest by all students of seventeenth-century drama. His bibliography contains several items that I, for one, had either missed completely or had not thought of in connection with this problem.

H. S.

not of the Prince of Orange, for in 1675 France and Holland were at war. P. 160; may I add that Parts I and II of my *History of French Dramatic Literature* were published in 1929 and 1932, not in "1920-28," and that only Part I was published by the Presses universitaires?

Medieval Number Symbolism, by V. F. HOPPER. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1938. Pp. xiv, 241. \$2.90. This book is vol. 132 of the Columbia University studies in English and Comparative Literature. It is well printed and bound and attractively got up. The work makes interesting reading, but is a survey rather than a study; it seems to have been designed as a work of vulgarization, and as such it ought to prove useful. The title of the book is somewhat deceptive, since only two of the seven chapters deal with medieval times. The seventh chapter, devoted to Dante, approaches a study more closely than the other chapters do, and this chapter might well have been published as a learned article, though even here the treatment is too sketchy to be probative. It might be better, perhaps, to say that the author, in his laudable endeavor to give us a picture of the wood, has done too much thinning of the trees; certainly his work leaves upon the reader the impression of thinness rather than solidity.

K. M.

A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, Sixth Supplement, 1935, pp. 1433-1550, and Seventh Supplement, 1938, pp. 1551-1652. By J. E. WELLS. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press. \$1.50 each. The *Manual* proper came out in 1916; its first supplement appeared in 1920; the other supplements have come out at three-year intervals. The various supplements have served us well, not least the last two, but their number now makes it needful to look up a given item in so many different places that one is perhaps justified in hoping for a new edition of the *Manual*, in which the supplementary material will be incorporated. By the year 1941 the *Manual* will have been in print for a quarter of a century, and the celebration might well take the form of a new edition. Let us hope it does.

K. M.

Historia Destructionis Troiae, by Guido de Columnis, edited by N. E. GRIFFIN. Med. Acad. of America, Publication No. 26; Cambridge, Mass., 1936. Pp. xviii, 293. \$4. This is an eclectic edition of the text of Guido; it makes no claims to finality, but will be useful to students interested not so much in Guido as in the history of the Troy tale. Besides the text we are given a seven-page introduction, a three-page glossary of uncommon words, and an index of proper names (unfortunately not all the occurrences of all the names are listed).

K. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

ROBERT A. HALL, JR., "ITALIAN ETYMOLOGICAL NOTES" (*Language*, xv, 34-42). J'ai qualifié ici (*MLN.*, 1939, p. 237) les étymologies de M. Hall de 'subjectives' ou 'impressionnistes' et je dois justifier ce jugement. M. H. a une façon cavalière de traiter les propositions étymologiques de grands devanciers comme impossibles, oiseuses ou peu convaincantes, mais ce qu'il oppose à des maîtres comme Schuchardt, Meyer-Lübke etc. ne sont que des suggestions gratuites, banales, ne sortant pas des habitudes des néogrammairiens de 1876, sans l'ombre d'une preuve, quelquefois un remaniement tout verbal de suggestions données longtemps avant lui par d'autres savants. Dire p. ex. que l'ital. *aduggere* 'inardir, aduggiare' (M. H. omet la première signification, qui est sans doute aussi la primitive, en traduisant 'to irritate, anger') et *uggia* 'disgust . . .' remontent à un radical **ugg-* qu'on obtient par la fusion de *ūr-ere* et *odium* et que ces deux mots italiens "are not usually listed together, despite the kinship of meaning" est faux, puisque Salvioni dans quelques lignes d'une magistrale brièveté (*Rev. de dial. rom.*, iv, 100), que M. H. rejette avec un laconisme moins magistral ("despite Salvioni's opinion"), les a groupés ensemble et les fait remonter tous deux à (*ad*)*ūrere*. Une étymologie simple sera toujours préférable à une étymologie à base de croisement. Pour le développement phonétique sur lequel ni Meyer-Lübke ni Salvioni ne se prononcent (parce que, évidemment, avec leurs connaissances profondes, ils n'y voyaient aucune difficulté), ne faut-il pas songer à la dissimilation si courante de *r-r* en *d-r* (*quaerere* > *chiedere*, *ferire* > *fiedere*)? *(*ad*)*ād(i)o* donne (*ad*)*uggio* comme **quaerio* > *cheggio* (d'ailleurs, dans les exemples fournis par Tomm.-Bell. on ne trouve pas l'infinitif de l'en-tête). La forme (*ad*)*uggiare* peut avoir été influencée par (*ab*)*bruciare*.

La façon de travailler de M. H. est assez douteuse: au sujet de sa supposition ital. *attraccare* = *attaccare* + *trarre*, j'avais communiqué à l'éditeur de *Language*, qui me consultait, la référence à Joan Coromines, *Homenatge a Rubió y Lluch*, III, 283, où cet auteur catalan prouve que plusieurs mots de marine italiens proviennent de Catalogne. M. H., sans avoir vu l'article et sans mentionner d'où il tient cette "reference," s'y oppose parce qu'un -*kk-* italien ne pourrait provenir d'un -*k-* catalan—il faut ne jamais avoir entendu le -*k-* intervocalique des langues ibériques pour risquer cette assertion; cf. ital. *vigliacco* < esp. *bellaco* . . . D'ailleurs le sens de *attraccare* 'accoster un quai pour embarquer ou débarquer des marchandises' (ce dernier détail, donné par le *Dizionario della marina* de l'Académie italienne et par Mistral, est passé sous silence par M. H.) se rattache, comme l'a bien vu Mistral, à prov. *traco* 'pile de planches, de bois de charpente,' *atraca* 'empiler, entasser,' et en dernier lieu à l'onomatopée **trak(k)* REW, n° 8846 (cf. esp. *tracquear* 'crépiter, secouer, agiter'). Encore une fois, la contamination n'est qu'un pis aller.

L' it. *incignare* 'étréner' serait un *encaeniare* + (in) *cingere*. J'avais transmis à l'auteur la référence au bel article de M. Jaberg, *RLR*, I, 122 seq. sur les mots signifiant 'commencer,' que le maître suisse place dans un vaste cadre d'histoire ecclésiastique. Au lieu de s'effrayer de sa propre sécheresse devant cet article si important et pour l'histoire des mots et pour l'histoire de la civilisation, M. H. a changé son texte original et, maintenant, ne mentionne de l'article de M. Jaberg qu'une objection selon lui possible, le piètre détail de l' *i* au lieu de *ē* qu'il explique par un croisement avec *cingere*. Mais **incēniare* > *incignare* est aussi correct en florentin du point de vue phonétique (*ē* > *i*) que *cingere* (fr. *ceindre*) et d'ailleurs aussi, *pace* M. H., *cominciare*, v. Meyer-Lübke, *Ital. Gr.* § 69.

Anc. vén. etc. (as) *sunar*, padouan *arsunar*, siennois *asciunare* serait un **ad-se-unare* 'to gather to oneself.' Tout romanisant ayant un peu de sens linguistique se dirait qu'un 'assembler à soi,' pléonastique et pétrifié aussi anciennement (des cas comme fr. *jordonner* ou esp. *ensimismarse* sont de beaucoup postérieurs), est impossible et isolé. Mais M. H. ne semble pas avoir consulté le *Beitrag* de Mussafia qui dit: "Es scheint ein Compositum mit *su s-*," ce qui est très plausible, vu l' a. esp. *de suno* [= *sub-ūnu*] 'ensemble,' galic. *asuar* 'rassembler' (REW^s s. v. *ūnus*). Pour sienn. *asciunare* cf. sienn. *sciugnolo* 'chétif,' REW s. v. *unus* et *Arch. rom.* VII, 396. Sur it. *coccolarsi* M. H. dit dictatoirement: "The semantic transition . . . 'to cluck' > 'to sit in the position of a brooding hen' > 'to squat' . . . is quite unlikely." Pourquoi? est-ce qu' un grec *coccyx* 'queue rudimentaire', inattesté dans les langues romanes, dont dériverait un **cocculum* gratuitement admis par l'auteur (comment *coccyx* avec son radical finissant en gutturale pourrait-il avoir un diminutif **cocculum*?—autant admettre *cochlea*!) et qui serait en plus développé d'une façon savante à cause de l' esp. *en cucullas*, à l'ombre d'une réalité?

Lucques *infolcarsi* 'cacciarsi, impacciarsi in una cosa' 'ingolfarsi' serait dérivé de la racine **fulc-* 'to push, drive, thrust' identique avec *fulc-ire* 'étayer, affermir, soutenir.' Je ne sais d' où M. H. a tiré un verbe **fulc-* (il ne nous donne pas la forme de l'infinitif!) dans le sens 'to push, drive, thrust.' Pense-t-il à ce lomb. etc. *folká* 'calpestare' que Salvioni, *Arch. glott.*, XVI, 449 expliquait par *follare* + *calcare* et Pieri, *ZRPh*, XXX, 301 par **fullicare*? M. H. ne dit un traître mot sur le **fulc-are* qu'il doit nécessairement admettre pour rendre compte du verbe italien. Revenons-nous à l'opération avec des racines, heureusement abandonnée depuis longtemps par les romanistes? Pour moi il s'agit d'un dérivé du germ. *fūlk* 'troupe, troupeau' (REW 3559) attesté au moins en a. fr., a. prov., a. ital. du Nord: 'se mêler à une foule,' cf. fr. dial. *foucade* 'flot, chute, survenance de gens nombreux qu'on n'attend pas,' 'espèce de panique qui se produit dans une bande de bœufs' . . . (FEW). M. H. se lance hardiment dans l'étymologie latine en expliquant *būbulcus* 'pâtre de bœufs' par son hypothétique **fulc-* 'to drive' (Ascoli avait déjà pensé à *fulcire* 'soutenir'!), alors que le rapport avec *φύλαξ* 'gardien' semble plus probable (cf. Walde, Boisacq).

L'argumentation de M. H. au sujet de *lazzo* 'stage trick, gag' = *actio*

d'après Pieri est spécieuse: "Such a learned origin for the term is unlikely, in view of the intellectual status of sixteenth and seventeenth century actors"—un mot savant ne le reste pas toujours, comme Gilliéron l'a montré et comme toute observation de n'importe quelle langue vivante peut le démontrer (cp. fr. *espérer, préparer, espèce* etc.). Or, *azzo* de *actio* (qui d'ailleurs a une texture moins savante que p. ex. *dazio, prefazio* = *datiō, praefatiō*) a un parallèle dans a. ital. *stazzo* 'arrêt' = *statio* que Pieri a mentionné, mais que M. H. s'abstient de discuter: qu'on lise les acceptions tout à fait populaires 'magasin,' 'hutte de feuillage,' 'parc,' 'étable' qu' a le mot dans les dialectes italiens et sardes (REW^s s. v. *statio*), pour se persuader qu'un *azzo* peut avoir été un mot semi-savant p. ex. au XII^{ème} siècle et être devenu un mot populaire au XVI^{ème}, date de l'apparition du sens 'théâtral.' En outre, le parallélisme sémantique de (l')*azzo* avec *atto* (Lucques *attoso* 'che fa mosse d'occhi e di volto con un certo fine e con artificio,' Bellinzona *atas* 'gesti composti,' Salvioni, *RdR*, iv, 96, ital. *atteggiare* etc.) est frappant. M. H. ne s'arrête pas aux phrases du *chianajuolo* (Arezzo) rapportées par Pieri pour *azzo*: *nun me piace l' tu' azzo* 'non mi piaccion le tue mosse,' *lo conosco a l'azzo* 'ho penetrato il suo divisamento ai segni esteriori,' indiquant clairement l'idée de 'acte, geste.' M. H. explique *atto* synonyme de *azzo* aux siècles XVI^{ème} et XVII^{ème} "as a Latinism in an attempt to connect the word with *actus* or *actiō*"—ici le 'latinisme,' auquel il avait fermé la porte principale du *The-saurus romanicus*, revient par une porte bâtarde (pourquoi dans l'hypothèse d'un *lazzo* = *laqueus* les acteurs soi-disant peu cultivés de la *Commedia dell'arte* auraient-ils songé à latiniser (l')*azzo* en *atto*?). *azzo* serait une "aphérèse" de *lazzo* = *laqueus*, ce qu'on comprend moins qu'une "forme agglutinée" *lazzo* de *azzo*: si *lazzo* était un mot populaire (= *laqueus* 'lacs'), comment arriverait-on à le décapiter? Au contraire un *azzo* semi-savant avait beaucoup plus de chances d'être affublé de l' de l'article (cf. fr. *luette* de l' *uette* = *ūva*, mot scientifique etc.). On devrait penser au moins que tous les parallèles anglais qui ont inspiré M. H. pour son *lazzo*: *catch, gag*, sont bien analysés. Eh bien, non! Le mot d'argot de théâtre anglo-américain *gag* est à l'origine un 'bâillon,' puis depuis 1847, "matter interpolated in a written piece by the actor" (*Oxf. Engl. Dict.*)—ce n'est donc pas du tout l'idée de "a joke conceived as something wherewith the audience is ensnared," mais de l' "interpolation," comme le bâillon est une matière "interpolée" dans la bouche de la victime.

Quel sens cela a-t-il d'opposer à l'étymon de Meyer-Lübke (REW^a, 5722, non pas 5709) **mukka* (onomatopéique) > ital. *mucca* 'vache' une contamination *vacca* + *mungere* 'traire'? La vache fait-elle moins *mū* qu'elle n'est traitée? Et l'all. n'a-t-il pas *Muhkuh* (comme *Bäh-lamm* etc.) à côté de *Milchkuh*? N'est-il pas plus vraisemblable que les enfants (qui ont été les premiers à appeler la vache *mukka* ou *Muhkuh*) ont été plus naturellement portés à envisager 'l'animal qui fait *mū*' que le but rationnel auquel il peut servir? Quelle science peu humaine et peu aérée que celle de M. Hall! Ne connaît-il pas au moins l'angl. *moo-cow*?

Dans la discussion de *dunque* M. H. opine: "The various etymologies based on *dōnec*, *dōnique* or *dum* fail to account for the grammatical and semantic differences between these words (subordinating conjunctions meaning 'until') and the Romance group (adverbs meaning 'then, therefore, well then')." Mais il ne dit pas que M. v. Wartburg, dans le FEW qu'il cite, a attiré l'attention sur un lat. vulg. *dum* 'par conséquent' attesté par Loefstedt, de sorte que *tum* + *dunc* peut bien suffire.

M. H. accuse Meyer-Lübke de "pétition de principe" "assuming an *eschlu* to explain Ital. *ischio* and then using this example on which to base a phonetic law of *i* < *e* before *-ski-*." Je suppose que tout établissement d'une loi phonétique passe d'abord par l'étape de pétition de principe ou d'"arbeitshypothese" et que M. H. ne fait autre chose en supposant, sur la foi de *teschio* de *těstula*, un *eschio* de *aesculu* > *esculu*. D'ailleurs Meyer-Lübke basait sa loi sur des exemples plus nombreux que M. H. la sienne: il est vrai que ce dernier essaie de faire disparaître ces autres exemples par des assertions erronées: p. ex. *viscum* 'gui' aurait *i* (d'où le sait-il? les langues romanes ne permettent pas cette base); *mischiare* serait influencé par *mīxtus* (> ital. *misto*): je défie M. H. de me produire un incontestable *mīxtus* latin, alors qu'il n'y a qu'un *mīxtus* en roman (ital. *misto* est naturellement un latinisme). Pour *biscia*, l'explication *bēstia* + *vīpera* de M. Tuttle que M. H. trouve être la meilleure, se heurte aux sens 'insecte,' 'ver,' 'biche,' 'agneau, mouton,' que M. Rohlfs a attestés pour la forme avec *-i-* tonique dans différentes langues romanes.

Le lecteur, impatienté par tant de rectifications triviales, se demandera peut-être pourquoi j'use son temps (et le mien) pour réfuter des explications viciées par la base: c'est que je suis parfois un peu attristé par une pratique étymologique chez certains romanisants américains qui ne semble pas à la hauteur des standards de revues comme *Romania* ou *Zeitschrift*. Me pardonnera-t-on ce fanatisme ou prosélytisme peut-être chimérique qui désire que tout dans ma patrie d'adoption soit, non seulement pas inférieur, mais supérieur au continent que j'ai quitté?

LEO SPITZER

WINCKELMANN. Professor Walther Rehm, Giessen, Germany, Wartweg 68, would be grateful for notices of manuscripts and especially of letters by J. J. Winckelmann which are to be found in this country. Professor Rehm is preparing with the support of the Prussian Academy of Science and the Archaeological Institute of Germany a critical edition of the works and letters of J. J. Winckelmann. Communications may be directed to Professor Karl Viëtor, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Baker, Ernest A.—The history of the English Novel, vol. X—Yesterday. *London*: H. F. and G. Witherby, 1939. Pp. 420. 16 sh.

Brown, Carleton (ed.).—Religious lyrics of the XVth century. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [*New York*: Oxford U. Press], 1939. Pp. xxxii + 394. \$3.50.

Chappell, Louis W.—Folk-songs of Roanoke and the Albemarle. *Morgantown, W. Va.*: Ballad Press, 1939. Pp. 203. \$3.00.

Estill, Adelaide D.—The sources of Synge. *Philadelphia*: U. of Pa. Press, 1939. Pp. 61. [U. of Pa. diss.]

Maxwell, Baldwin.—Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger. *Chapel Hill, North Carolina*: U. of N. C. Press, 1939. Pp. x + 238. \$3.00.

O'Neill, Edward H.—Biography by Americans, 1658-1936, a subject bibliography. *Philadelphia*: U. of Pa. Press, 1939. Pp. x + 465. \$4.00.

Watkins, W. B. C.—Perilous balance, the tragic genius of Swift, Johnson, and Sterne. *Princeton, N. J.*: Princeton U. Press, 1939. Pp. x + 172. \$2.00.

Wilson, R. M.—Early Middle English literature. *London*: Methuen, 1939. Pp. x + 309. 8 sh. 6 d.

GERMAN

Bader, Wilhelm.—Goethes Farbenlehre als Ausdruck seiner Metaphysik. Diss. *Hamburg* 11: Hansischer Gildenverlag, 1939. 66 pp. M. 3.30.

Bithell, Jethro.—Modern German Literature 1880-1938. *London*: Methuen & Co. [1939]. vi, 535 pp.

Blanke, Gustav.—Hermann Stehrs Menschengestaltung. Diss. Münster. [Neue deutsche Forschungen. Abt. Neuere deutsche Literaturgeschichte Bd. 21]. *Berlin*: Junker & Dünhaupt, 1939. 104 pp. M. 4.50.

Bielfeldt, Franz.—Hebbels Menschengestaltung als dichterischer Ausdruck nordisch-deutschen Wesens. Ein Beitrag zur literarhistorischen Anthropologie des 19. Jahrhunderts. [Germanische Studien Hft. 209]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1939. 115 pp.

Braune, Wilhelm.—Gotische Grammatik mit Lesestücken und Wortverzeichnis. 11. Aufl., bearb. von Karl Helm. [Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germ. Dialekte. A. Nr. 1]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1939. viii, 199 pp. M. 4.50.

Guenther, Felix, J. Leo Traub, Harold Lenz.—Neue alte Lieder (German folksongs for class and club uses). *New York*: G. E. Stechert & Co. [1939]. 32 pp. \$0.15.

Halbach, Kurt Herbert.—Franzoselementum und Deutschtum in höfischer Dichtung des Stauferzeitalters. Hartmann von Aue und Crestien de Troyes-Iwein-Ivain. [Neue deutsche Forschungen. Abt. Deutsche Philologie. Bd. 7]. *Berlin*: Junker u. Dünhaupt, 1939. 196 pp. M. 8.50.

Hartmann von Aue.—Erec. Hrsg. von Albert Leitzmann. [Altdeutsche Textbibliothek. Nr. 39]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1936. xxxvi, 262 pp. M. 6.

Hörmann, Paul.—Untersuchungen zur Verslehre Otfriids. Diss. [Aus: Literaturwiss. Jahrbuch d. Görres-Ges. Bd. 9]. *Freiburg i. B.*: Herder, 1939. vi, 105 pp. 4°.

Karstien, Carl.—Historische deutsche Grammatik. [Germanische Bibliothek, 1. Abt. Elementar- und Handbücher. 1. Reihe, Grammatiken, 20, 1]. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1939. xlv, 200 pp. M. 9.

Koch, Gustav.—Adolph Müllner als Theaterkritiker, Journalist und literarischer Organisator. Diss. Köln. [Die Schaubühne. Bd. 28]. *Emsdetten*: Lechte, 1939. 110 pp. M. 4.50.

Lock, Gerhard.—Der höfisch-galante Roman des 17. Jhs. bei Eberhard Werner Happel. Diss. Berlin. *Würzburg*: Triltsch, 1939. 103 pp. M. 3.

Mittelhochdeutsche Minnereden. 2. Die Heidelberger Hss. 313 u. 355; Die Berliner Hs. Ms. Germ. Fol. 922. Auf Grund der Vorarbeit von Wilhelm Brauns. hrsg. von Gerhard Thiele. Mit 4 Tafeln. [Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters. Bd. 41]. *Berlin*: Weidmann, 1938. xxviii, 248 pp. 4°. M. 19.50.

Pongs, Hermann.—Das Bild in der Dichtung. 2. Voruntersuchungen zum Symbol. *Marburg*: Elwert, 1939. 632 pp. M. 20.

Priebsch, Robert.—Letter from Heaven on the observance of the Lord's Day. *Oxford*: Basil Blackwell, 1936. xxii, 37 pp.

Schneider, Hermann.—Richard Wagner und das germanische Altertum. Vortrag. [Philosophie und Geschichte. 66]. *Tübingen*: Mohr, 1939. 32 pp. M. 1.50.

Schwarz, Ernst.—Untersuchungen zur deutschen Sprach- und Volkstums-geschichte Mittelmährens. Mit 6 Karten. [Arbeiten zur sprachlichen Volksforschung in den Sudetenländern. H. 5]. *Brünn, Leipzig*: Rohrer, 1939. xii, 74 pp. M. 4.50.

Ulrich von Tüheim.—Rennewart. Aus der Berliner und Heidelberger Hs. hrsg. von Alfred Hübner. Mit 2 Tafeln in Lichtdruck. [Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters. Bd. 39]. *Berlin*: Weidmann, 1938. li, 614 pp. 4°. M. 43.

Warnecke, Rudolf.—Haus und Hof in der niederdeutschen Sprache zwischen Weser und Hunte. [Deutsche Dialektgeographie. H. 35]. *Marburg*: Elwert, 1939. xiii, 78 pp., 4 Plates. M. 7.50.

Zeller, Rose.—Die Gudrunlieder der Edda. Diss. [Tübinger germanistische Arbeiten. Bd. 26 = Sonderreihe Bd. 5]. *Stuttgart*: Kohlhammer, 1939. xii, 116 pp. M. 6.

FRENCH

Archambault, P.—Ch. Péguy. *Paris*: Bloud et Gay, 1939. 160 pp. Fr. 15.

Bac, Ferdinand.—Mérimee inconnu. *Paris*: Hachette, 1939. 249 pp. Fr. 20.

Bandy, W. T.—A Word Index to Baudelaire's Poems. *Madison, Wis.*: 1939. iv + 92 pp. (lithotyped).

Bingham, A. J.—M.-J. Chénier, early political life (1789-94). *New York*: 1939. xiv + 210 pp.

Boileau.—Eptres. Art p. Lutrin. Ed. Ch.-H. Boudhors. *Paris*: Les Belles Lettres, 1939. 375 pp. Fr. 30. (Ass. Guillaume Budé.)

Cowdrick, Ruth E.—The Early Reading of Pierre Bayle, privately printed (1939). 216 pp. (Columbia U. diss.)

Dauzat, A.—La Toponymie fr. *Paris*: Payot, 1939. 338 pp. Fr. 60.

Folie Tristan, d'Oxford, ed. E. Hoepffner. *Paris*: Les Belles Lettres, 1938. 189 pp. Fr. 20. (Pubs. de l'U. de Strasbourg, 8.)

Gide, A.—L'Evolution du théâtre, ed. Carl Wildmann. *Manchester*: U. of Manchester, 1939. 39 pp.

Grente, Pauphilet etc.—Dictionnaire des lettres fr. Fasc. I. *Paris*: Beauchesne, 1939. xxii + 42 pp. Fr. 24.

Jean-Maurienne.—Tribulations de la Soc. des Amis d'O. Mirbeau. *Paris*: Soc. fr. d'impr., 1939. 248 pp. Fr. 15.

La Taille, Jean de.—De l'Art de la tragédie, ed. Frederick West. *Manchester*: U. of Manchester, 1939. 39 pp.

Lautréamont, Comte de.—Œuvres complètes. Introd. par A. Breton. *Paris*: G. L. M., 1938. xv + 421 pp. Fr. 30.

Palleske, S. O.—Maeterlinck en Allemagne. *Paris*: Les Belles Lettres, 1938. 189 pp. Fr. 30.

Puget, C.-A.—Les Jours heureux, ed. F. Ernst. *New York*: Cordon, 1939. ii + 154 pp.

Rey, Achille.—Un aspect nouveau de Fr. Mistral. *Avignon*: Ed. des Tablettes d'Avignon, 1939. 163 pp. Fr. 20.

Rousseau, J.-J.—Dialogues. Rêveries. Corresp. Ed. P. Richard. *Paris*: Larousse, 1938. 116 pp. Fr. 2.50.

Rozbroj, Hugo.—Jean-Paul Marat (1743-93). Ein Naturforscher u. Revolutionär, sein Zusammentreffen in der Geisteswelt mit Goethe, Lamarek, Rousseau u. a. Berlin diss., 1937. 138 pp.

Ryan, Lee W.—French Travelers in the Southeastern U. S., 1775-1800. *Bloomington*: Principia Press, 1939. viii + 107 pp. \$2.00.

Sarrasin.—Le Roman du Hem, ed. Albert Henry. *Paris*: Les Belles Lettres (1938). exxii + 173 pp.

Scarron.—Le Roman comique, ed. Magne. *Paris*: Garnier, 1938. xxiv + 440 pp. Fr. 15.

Spalikowski, E.—A propos des séjours normands de P. Corneille. *Rouen*: Lainé, 1938. 18 pp.

Wilson, R. A.—The Pre-War biographies of Romain Rolland. *London and New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1939. 234 + iv pp. \$3.75.

ITALIAN

Apolloni, E.—Guida alle Biblioteche italiane. *Milano*: Mondadori, 1939. 212 pp. L. 14.

Bartoli, Daniello.—Scritti vari. Antologia da 12 opere con note commenti e introduzione di Michele Rigillo. *Milano*: Signorelli, 1939. 179 pp. L. 7.

Carducci, G.; Del Lungo, I.—Epistolario fra Giosuè Carducci e Isidoro Del Lungo 1858-1906. *Firenze*: Le Monnier, 1939. viii + 386 pp. con 24 tavv. L. 18.

Chiari, Alberto.—Lecture dantesche. *Firenze*: Le Monnier, 1939. 222 pp. L. 15.

Ermini, A.—Note leopardiane. *Roma*: "Ausonia," 1939. 32 pp. L. 5.

Ferrero, G.—L'anima e la poesia di Vittorio Alfieri. 2a ediz. rinnovata. *Torino*: Paravia, 1939. 371 pp. L. 17.

—Prosa illustre dell'Ottocento: Giordani-Botta-Colletta. *Torino*: Paravia, 1939. 130 pp. L. 7.

Morrone, G.—Parabola del Romanticismo. *Bari*: Macri, 1939. 116 pp. L. 10.

Petrarca, Fr.—Le Rime, i Trionfi e le opere latine. Scelta e commento di Emanuele Ciarfardini. *Firenze*: Le Monnier, 1939. viii + 207 pp. L. 11.

Repertorio bibliografico della storia e della critica della letteratura italiana dal 1902 al 1932 (preparato sotto la direzione di Giuseppe Prezzolini). Vol. II: M-Z. *Roma*: Ediz. "Roma," 1939. Pp. 573-1099.

Santini, Emilio.—Vittorio Alfieri. *Palermo*: Palumbo, 1939. 214 pp. L. 20.

Stoppani, P.—La parlata di Meneghino. Dialectica. 2a ediz. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1939. xii + 334 pp. L. 10.

Zamboni, Armando.—Fulvio Testi (1593-1646). *Torino*: Paravia, 1939. 111 pp. L. 5.

43-
är,
elt
lin

che
m:
D.
ert
(3).

ne.
15.
urs
né,

ien
k:
75.

ta-
pp.

gia
lu-
lli,

rio
ago
viii

Fi-
5.
ia:

rio
ria,

GI-
39.

mo.

ere
tia-
+

ella
902
di
na:

Pa-

ino.
rdi,

93-
u. 5.

THE OLD GERMANIC PRINCIPLES OF NAME-GIVING

BY

HENRY BOSLEY WOOLF

*Assistant Professor of English
Louisiana State University*

This study falls into two parts, one concerned with the naming of those Germanic tribes who migrated to England, the other with those who remained on the Continent. After an introduction are to be found chapters on the royal families of East Anglia, Essex, Kent, Lindsey, Mercia, Bernicia, Deira, and Wessex. Then follows a long chapter dealing with the Old English non-royal families, in which an attempt is made to find out what ways the names of those not of the royal blood differ from those of their rulers. The next chapter, which treats Old English poetry, is in the main a consideration of the Beowulfian genealogies. Chapters on the Scandinavians, the Merovingians, the Goths, the Langobards, the Burgundians and some others, together with a conclusion, complete the volume. There is a bibliography, and an extensive index of names.

xii + 299 pages, 8vo, cloth, \$4.00

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

EUROPEAN JOURNALS AND THE WAR

The non-receipt by a subscriber of any European chemical or other scientific journal seriously needed as research material should be promptly reported to the American Documentation Institute.

The Cultural Relations Committee of ADI, which cooperates closely with the Cultural Relations Division of the Department of State, is working on this problem, and hopes to be able to surmount such war obstacles as interrupted transportation, embargoes and censorship, which so grievously affected the progress of research during the last war.

The principle should be established, if possible, that the materials of research having no relation to war shall continue to pass freely, regardless of the countries of origin or destination.

Reports, with full details of where subscription was placed and name and address of subscriber, volume, date and number of last issue received, should be addressed to:

AMERICAN DOCUMENTATION INSTITUTE, *Bibliofilm Service*
c/o U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE LIBRARY
WASHINGTON, D. C.

"A magnificent piece of scholarship"

HEATH'S STANDARD FRENCH AND ENGLISH DICTIONARY

J. E. MANSION

An eminently practical book of reference. It covers the vocabularies of the newer aspects of twentieth-century civilization and at the same time provides a key to the great treasure of French classic literature.

PART I. FRENCH TO ENGLISH. \$12.50

PART II. ENGLISH TO FRENCH. \$15.00

Parts I and II ordered together, \$25.00

These prices subject to our usual discounts

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO ATLANTA SAN FRANCISCO DALLAS LONDON

New and
Forthcoming
Holt
Texts

THE COLLEGE BOOK OF ESSAYS

John Abbot Clark

Michigan State College

Already adopted in many institutions

"I consider Clark's THE COLLEGE BOOK OF ESSAYS thoroughly practical and well selected—it is a comprehensive and varied collection that should prove most useful in appealing to the many and often widely differing minds of students in English courses."

K. S. EGILSRUD, *University of Minnesota*

"It is the most thrilling, engrossing book of essays that I have examined for a long time. I must find a place for it."

W. B. LEAKE, *University of Mississippi*

Price, \$2.00

Coming this Spring ~ INTRODUCTION TO WORLD LITERATURE

By Albert Guérard

Stanford University

Henry Holt and Company

257 Fourth Avenue
New York, New York